He said:

I want to say in cornection with a sudden change that it has never seemed to us at any time t'at a sudden change should be made, but that these various organizations should be taken over under another control. We certainly should regard it as most unfortunate if the splendid buying organizations that have been created, particularly such an organization as the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, should be disturbed; but in our indement there is no reason why that bureau should not be responsible to a man who was responsible for the activities of other bureaus and buying departments, so that he could bring about a common connection and singleness of purpose between them.

them. The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you would not wipe out any of the organizations, but would leave to the central power—whatever you might call him—the authority to absorb, to utilize, and to eliminate as he saw fit.

Mr. CATCHINGS. It seems to us, sir, that it is quite unthinkable in this enormous enterprise, of such a vital nature and difficulty, to consider destroying what we have. You must use what you have and build up from it Xou can not stop fighting the war while we create an organization. [R. 1901.]

Every man there whose experience was such as to bring him in contact with the organization of the war machine, and who had seen its development and its operation, who was capable of forming an opinion, said that was the only improvement he could suggest in the organization as it now existed. The Overman bill provides that the President shall appoint this man for the exercise of this clastic power; that he shall report directly to the President, and that he shall remedy any particular condition that seems to be wrong, using all other departments and agencies in all other departments where it is necessary to do so. That bill will remedy any possible defect that can be conceived

to exist along that line.

Now as to the war-cabinet bill: If the President is capable of conducting this war as Commander in Chief of the Army of these United States, he ought to have granted to him all the these United States, he ought to have granted to him all the power of the Nation that he thinks necessary to be used. We have said he is capable. The people have said so. The people of these United States implicitly believe so. This war-cabinet bill, as proposed, would take away from him the function of being Commander in Chief of the Army, and of carrying on the campaigns as he thinks they ought to be conducted. I say that the war cabinet proposed, with its fixed authority and its fixed jurisdiction and with the right to do the things that are proposed to be given it to do by the bill that has been introproposed to be given it to do by the bill that has been introduced, would conflict with the operations of the departments of the Government by the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, and that it could not but result in confusion and injury to the conduct of any possible plan of conduct of the war. No wonder that the President has objected to this; and the necessity for it is not shown to exist. What could have been done that has not been done?

Mr. President, I have only discussed the matter along the line of criticism. I did not intend to do anything but discuss the two measures when I started out; but I believe, on the whole, that remarkable things have been accomplished by the agencies that have already been developed; that it was not possible to do these things without making a few mistakes, without a plan miscarrying here and there. Having seen the entire investigation, with my experience in the past in weighing testimony, with my experience in the past in deciding controversies and cases, I believe that there is no particular thing or things done or left undone that can be pointed out that should condemn this war machine as inefficient. I believe that all has been done, and reasonably well done, that was humanly possible under existing conditions since war was declared by these United States. If anything has not been done that ought to have been done, a war cabinet could not have remedied it, in my opinion; and I believe in future if there is necessity for improving this machine that the agencies provided by the Overman bill will do it without confusion, that they will do it without disorganization or interruption of a machine that has done all these things so well, and can do all things necessary to be done better in future for having done them in the past.

BAILROAD CONTROL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes.

RECESS.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, several Senators who intend to discuss the railroad bill have intimated that they desired to make such preparation. In view of the importance of the bill, the absence of a number of Senators, and the difficulty at this time of securing the attendance of a

sufficient number to give the matter the attention that it deserves, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 16, 1918, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 15, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Couden, of Washington, D. C., offered the fol-

lowing prayer:

Our Father which art in Heaven, we thank Thee for the historic religious ideals that find freedom in our Nation and that are zealously serving our needs to-day; for Judaism, with its ancient glory of the law and the prophets; for Catholicism, with its organization and conservation; for Protestant Christianity, with its differences, its unities, and its openness. Unite us all

under the flag for world justice, humanity, and kinship.

By the lips of Thy Son Thou hast said, "Many are called, but few are chosen." Let the myriads in our Nation hear and answer the call to political, industrial, financial, and domestic loyalty; and let the few chosen to plan and to lead, as the Members of this House be wise in counsel and true to their grave responsibilities. In the name of Jesus the Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. Gregg, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for three days, on account of illness.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

Hon. Champ Clark, Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Accounts. Sincerely, yours, Christopher D. Sullivan.

The resignation was accepted.

H. H. HOGAN.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider in the House the bill (S. 3689) authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan, of Kansas City, Mo.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unani-

mous consent to consider the bill S. 3689.

Mr. COX. Let it be reported, Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That should the Postmaster General find as a fact that the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan, of Kansas City, Mo., was entered into prior to the entrance of the United States into the war with Germany, and that the prices agreed to be paid in said contract are at the present time inequitable and unjust by reason of the increase in the cost of materials and labor employed in the performance of such contract, the Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, with the consent of the said H. H. Hogan and his bondsmen, to cancel the same or to readjust the terms of said contract in such manner as to relieve the contractor from the hardships being by him suffered on account of such increased costs and expenses.

The SPEAKER Is there objection?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of no quorum, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-seven Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the

Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following-named Members

failed to answer to their names:

Anthony Austin Bacharach Beakes Bland Bland
Bowers
Britten
Campbell, Kans.
Capstick
Carter, Mass.
Clark, Fla.
Coady
Cooper, Ohio
Copley
Costello Costello Francis

Currie, Mich. Curry, Cal. Dallinger Darrow Davidson Fuller, Mass. Godwin, N. C. Goodall Graham, Pa. Graham, Pa. Gray, Ala. Gray, N. J. Green, Iowa Gregg Hamilton, N. Y. Drukker Dyer Eagan Eagle Ellsworth
Fairchild, B. L.
Fairchild, G. W.
Flynn
Focht Haugen Heintz Hollingsworth Hood Houston Huddleston

Humphreys Husted Hutchinson Ireland Johnson, S. Dak. Jones, Va. Kabn King LaGuardia Littlepage Lunn McCormick McLaughlin, Pa. Maher

Mann

Miller, Minn, Moores, Ind. Neely Nelson Nicholls, S. C. Nichols, Mich. Nolan Platt Price

Purnell Ragsdale Robinson Rodenberg Rucker Sabath Sanders, Ind. Sanders, La. Scott, Pa. Scully Slemp Smith, T. F. Sterling, Ill. Strong Tinkham Van Dyke

Vare Venable Voigt Ward Webb Wilson, La. Wilson, Tex. Winslow

The SPEAKER. On this call 335 Members have answered to their names

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to. The doors were opened.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 3433. An act requiring the Government to furnish uniforms to officers of the Army or Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I nominate for election the gentleman from New Mexico, William B. Walton, as a member of the Committee on Irrigation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina nomi-

nates the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. WILLIAM B. WALTON, to be a member of the Committee on Irrigation.

The question was taken, and Mr. Walton was elected.

H. H. HOGAN.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for the consideration of the bill S. 3689, authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. H. Hogan, at Kansas City, Mo.
The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWELL. I object.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with,

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection. Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, presenting, as chairman of the Committee on Appropria-tions, the first bill from that committee since it fell to my lot to succeed the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, I believe that I may be pardoned for saying just a very few words outside of the bill proper. There has been in this country from time to time, and especially recently, considerable agitation for what is generally spoken of as a budget system for the consideration of the financial affairs of the Nation. Unfortunately we have always been more or less under the tyranny of phrases, and, as a result of that loose thinking that sometimes seems to be a national characteristic, many people speak about a budget system without any realization of what is involved, and much criticism that is unintelligent is leveled at Congress, and much praise is given administrative suggestion because of the supposed failure of Congress to institute a budget system.

I shall not to-day take time to go elaborately into this subject. I hope at a future day to speak concerning it at length, but I do want to say a few words touching the recommendation that has been made by the President of the United States in favor of one appropriating committee of the House, and also touching the broad aspect of a budget. Personally I have always favored a concentration of appropriating power, but I do not consider that that represents in any degree an adequate remedy or anything more than a step toward a budget consideration, and I have not sought to press it at this time because of the tremendous tasks that are placed upon Congress and the Government in connection with the prosecution of this war. To undertake a reform of that magnitude, a reform that did not meet with the universal acquiescence of the House, would

have been simply to cripple and not help in the presentation of great financial bills. No man at this time desires to be chairman of the appropriating committee carrying the power to appropriate for all departments unless he could have behind him the support of the entire membership of the House. have undertaken that reform, even though a majority of this Congress favored it, and then to have been faced with a minority that was opposed to and sullen because of such a change would have been to so cripple the efficiency of the committee having charge of appropriations as to have practically destroyed it; and realizing that, it would have been folly on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations now to urge that reform. But I am not willing that the absence of any action should be construed as a permanent acquiescence in the present system.

But even the putting of all power into the hands of the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee would of itself be of little value unless it was accompanied, first, by the presentation of estimates from the administrative branch of the Government in budget form, and second, the consideration by the Congress of those estimates in their totals, as well as in their

separate details.

It is a simple fact that there is nothing required except an Executive order in order immediately to put into effect an administrative consideration of estimates from a budgetary standpoint. At present all estimates are made by the heads of the various departments, and they go to the various Cabinet offi-cials, who in turn give them to the Secretary of the Treasury, who transmits them to Congress. He transmits them without any power to review them to change them, but simply as the messenger through which they reach Congress. Nothing is needed except the desire of a President-and this has been true always-to have consideration at his council chamber of those estimates as they come from the various departments in their relationship to each other, and the giving to the Secretary of the Treasury the power to act as a real financial head of the Government with power to supervise and control the estimates of the various departments. And until that reform is under-taken by the administrative end of the Government no real budgetary system can be put into effect. That fact should be borne in mind by those who are so free unintelligently to criticize the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. If the budget system were in effect to-day and this committee was called upon to report simply on the request of the department under the budget system, this bill would carry \$523,572,000 more than it does.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not necessarily. Congress would not have to vote all that was asked, simply because asked, as a result of a budgetary consideration by the administrative officers

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHERLEY. I do not want to be diverted into too long a talk on this question, because I have so much to present in

connection with the bill. I yield briefly.

Mr. MONDELL. My recollection is that President Taft at one time made something of an effort along this line. I do not know whether he had a Cabinet consideration of estimates or a

personal consideration by the President,
Mr. SHERLEY. Every President has had a certain consideration by the Cabinet and by himself of the estimates made by the different departments in their relation to each other, but there has never been a Secretary of the Treasury with the power to revise and control the estimates of other departments. I called attention, in a speech made a number of years ago dur-ing the administration of Mr. Taft, to the effort that was made by John Sherman as Secretary of the Treasury to obtain just that power and the opposition it met with from every other Cabinet official, an opposition which served to prevent the reform being adopted.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman stated that he believed that it would not be wise to have the appropriations in the hands of one committee so long as there was an active minority opposed I assume those views are limited to the duration of the to it.

I did not mean to make it Mr. SHERLEY. Unquestionably. I did not mean to make it so broad as to say that because there was always somebody objecting that therefore it should not be done; but I did mean to say that at this time to undertake a reform of that magnitude without the general consent of everybody would be to simply confuse and not clarify the situation.

Mr. LENROOT. I thought that was what the gentleman had

Mr. SHERLEY. And as a practical man I tried to recognize that situation. The true idea of a budget is one that requires the consideration of expenditures in their relationship not simply to the merit of the activity proposed but also the relative merit of one activity as compared to another, and this consideration in its relationship to the fundamental one of the ability of the country properly to stand the taxation necessary to pay for the expenditures made. In other words, in peace times, after determining the desirability of expenditures, the amount of them that are to be made should be determined by the burden that they will place upon the Nation.

But in war times just the converse of that proposition becomes true as to the large expenditures, because in time of war you have to consider not what you properly can do, but what you must do. We make appropriations at this time of war not with regard to the burden that they will place upon the people of America, but we make them with regard to the requirements of prosecuting and winning the war and because that is superlative every other consideration must give way. So there is an entirely different relationship in regard to expenditures in war times than what they are in peace times, and the need for a budget in a peace-time sense does not exist in war time.

Now, there is another matter in connection with the budget that is very important for the Congress to consider whenever we get to a period where consideration can be given to other than war matters. No man trusts an agent that he can not control. Under our system of government the legislative branch does not control the administrative agents of the Government. We can deny them moneys, but except to a very limited sense we have nothing to do with the selection of the various agents who carry out the various policies. If a member of the Cabinet is carrying on work in an unsatisfactory way to the Government, Congress has no control over him, or rather has no control by which he can be removed and other of its choice selected. It can simply express its lack of confidence by refusing moneys, but the President alone can determine the personnel. Now, the result of that has always been, and probably always will be, to cause a certain amount of friction between the legislative and administrative ends of government, and as a result of that the legislative end has undertaken to prevent what it thought would be abuses of power by constant limitations and by classifications and enumerations, so that our supply bills have become so detailed that the committees dealing with them and the Congress dealing with them spend days and weeks and months in consideration of details that ought not to concern Congress at all, because just to the extent that the Congress is forced to give its time annually to little details—the number of clerks, the salaries they shall be paid, and the internal organization of this bureau and that bureau—just to that extent will it cease to have a voice in the great policies of the Government. And that is what has been happening for the past 40 years in America.

More and more Congress spends hours and days of debate touching clerks' salaries and less and less touching the great policies of the Nation. If this body, the responsible representative body in a true democracy, is to have the power it ought to have, it must have time to deal with the big things and not the need of dealing with the small things. Now, in order that that may happen we must have a reform in the methods of governmental bookkeeping. At present your governmental bookkeeping is for one purpose, and one purpose only, and that is to prevent embezzlement or misappropriation of funds, and it performs that service exceedingly well, but it performs no other. All of your appropriations are so made and your bookkeeping accounts so kept that they serve only in preventing Smith or Brown from spending money for some purpose other than that for which it was appropriated, but do not require There is no system by which or show economy of expenditure. the legislative body could take the expenditures of a previous period and from them determine whether they have been economically or wastefully expended; and as a result, in order to ascer tain that, we go through a cross-examination of individuals that amounts at times to a severe grilling of them and frequently without obtaining any real result. When we find some abuse we come in and recommend a particular provision prohibiting the doing of something that we think brought on the abuse and we tie the hands, or try to tie the hands, of an incompetent administrative officer, and then wake up a few weeks afterwards and find we have also tied the hands of all the good administrative officers as well and that the bad administrative officer has usually found some method of circumventing the prohibition that we placed upon him. I remember a great speech made by Roosevelt some years ago in which this was the dominant thought, that you can not tie a man's hands and prevent him from doing harm without at the same time preventing him from doing good.

Now, our Government was built in the beginning upon the theory that all power would be abused and that the only remedy for the abuse of power was so to divide it as to prevent anyone from doing much harm, and, incidentally, we succeeded as well in preventing a great many people from doing much good, and if it was not for the practicability of the people of America in overriding mechanical obstacles that are constantly put in their way we would have more difficulty than we have. Now, if you will get a system so you can know whether an administrative officer is well or badly performing his functions, then the remedy will be not to curtail his power, but to cut off his head when he does not deliver. [Applause.] When he fails to show that he is an efficient officer let him go into the discard and let some man of capacity take his place. [Applause.] That is the tendency of all modern government everywhere except here on this floor and in national matters.

Mr. MADDEN. What suggestion has the gentleman to offer? Mr. SHERLEY. The whole tendency of modern govern-Mr. SHERLEY. The whole tendency of modern govern-mental thought is to put responsibility and power together, and then the people, knowing who is responsible, know how to remedy matters when things go wrong.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Mr. MADDEN. What is the gentleman's remedy; how is the gentleman going to reach the question that he is talking about now; how is he going to get control over the executive branch of the Government through the Congress so as to compel them

to be efficient, economical, and effective?

Mr. SHERLEY. Part of it can not be done without a great change in our organic law. Part of it can be done by one of the suggestions I have just made, and that is a system of bookkeeping that will enable committees to see what has been done in the previous year without going through the labor that we go through now. We have to examine into everything now in order to find out anything that may be wrong. A proper system of cost keeping, a modern system, whereby you find what it costs to perform a given activity would enable a committee reviewing the activities of the Government for any previous period to determine whether it had been economically done or not, and then when it found it had not been so performed, it could very easily deal with that particular situation, and it would not have to spend the time it now does in going into every detail. It could then appropriate moneys in lump sums very much larger than we have done in the past.

There has grown up an idea, that I shared here for many years, that it was the wise thing for Congress to appropriate money in great detail specifiying and limiting power of administrative officers. It was the prevalent idea of the committee of whic't I am a member, and particularly the prevalent idea of the then distinguished clerk of that committee, Mr. Courts. and yet it is an idea that is fundamentally wrong, because it is bound to lead, as it is leading, to worse and worse confusion.

One result is that a good administrative officer has to ask for more money for each purpose than he would have to ask as a total for all purposes, because he is limited and tied, and has no leeway. So what I would like to see is a reform in the methods of keeping the accounts, whereby the committees could check up their activities and fix responsibility, and then we could appropriate money in large sums; and that part of the appropriation which is mechanical could be made each year as it is made in most governments, by a few lines of legislation, without a rewriting of so many clerks of Class A, B, C, and D, and free Congress from spending its time with little, insignificant things. We have reached a time and place in the world's affairs where the Congress of the United States must consider bigger matters than simply the pay of a particular clerk and a particular department

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman was discussing in way the responsibility of Cabinet officers to Congress. I had a letter the other day from a gentleman who is quite a student, and who suggested in his letter that a change ought to be made whereby Congress, by a vote of lack of confidence in a Cabinet officer, would automatically vacate that office. Would the gentleman think that such an arrangement as that, patterned somewhat after the English system, would be a remedy for what he suggests?

Mr. SHERLEY. Perhaps so, though it carries with it more changes than just what the suggestion indicates.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. In just a moment. I would welcome giving Cabinet officers certain days on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I would do it for two reasons—not only to give the Cabinet officer an opportunity to present his case in the open, but I would also do it because it would give to Congress an opportunity to explode a great many false reputations that have existed in America for a great many years past. [Ap-

Mr. ROSE. I would like to ask the gentleman if by what he has just said he intended to convey the idea that he favors great appropriations rather than enumerating the causes for

which the money is appropriated?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I do not. I mean to say that when you have a system of bookkeeping by which you can tell when a man is not only disregarding the purpose for which moneys are given, but also when he has expended them unwisely and extravagantly, that then we can afford to appropriate in large sums with less specification, because every adminstrative officer will know that on his head rests the responsibility of having those moneys properly expended and that he can not hide or shirk that respon-

Mr. ROSE. In what manner then would you bring before the Congress the items making up the appropriations asked for?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would bring them as we are bringing some now, but by the reform we would not be doing it without Congress knowing anything about it half the time. Dozens and dozens of items are being carried in great lump sums, and have been carried in years past, because if we were to specify all of them we would simply do nothing else. Take ordnance, and you vote a thousand million dollars to ordnance officers to expend. Even in the old days you voted five to ten millions of dollars to them in three or four lines. Now, you had to trust those officials in the expenditure of those appropriations. And then you would turn around and specify to the last degree how many people those ordnance officers should have as clerks in their offices. You gave them the control over millions and millions, and said, "You are not worthy of being trusted to say whether you ought to have five or seven clerks in the administration of that fund.' And if you can get folly worse than that, I have yet to see it. And you did it without any system of bookkeeping and report to Congress whereby you could tell how well or poorly the work was being done and only by examinations that a few committees occasionally made as to some expenditures did you learn some of the facts that ought to be plainly shown by periodical state-

What has been the result? When the great war broke there happened just what I prophesied three years ago would happen. namely, a breakdown at the desk of these administrative officers, not because they were inefficient, not because the Government was not efficient in the sense that term is used ordinarily, but because Congress had refused for years to give a sufficient corps capable of expending quickly and dealing with a great matter such as was thrust upon it. And every man who wants to be honest must admit it. And yet there is always a tendency here to blame the other man for failures and never to look into our own hearts to see how far we are to blame for those things.

But I do not desire now to deal further with the subject of I hope to make to the House some time a speech at some length dealing with that alone. However, I did not want as chairman of the committee to present my first bill and

totally ignore this very important subject.

I desire now to address myself to the bill. It is one of great magnitude. It is a bill that carries in the way of cash an authorization for more money than used to be expended in the entire running of the Government for a tiscal year. words, as a matter of deficiency, to make up the things that were overlooked or could not be anticipated, we are now appropriating more money than we formerly appropriated for the entire conduct of the Government for a year. And that is but an illustration of this great essential fact, that should be borne in the minds of all men in responsible place, that the most difficult thing that has come to a public man now, to-day, is to keep a proper perspective, to realize something of the magnitude of affairs in the great drama that is being played and of which he

I could stand on this floor for hours and speak nothing that was not literally true, and speak nothing that was not critical of the prosecution of this war; and yet my speech would be false. And I could stand here for a day and speak of nothing that was not complimentary and to the credit of the administration of this war, every word of it being true, and yet my speech would be false. And so it is very easy for gentlemen to find things that are wrong. It is very easy to enumerate what seems a great many things that are wrong and thereby conclude that everything is wrong, and yet the facts, the real facts, would not warrant it, because the only way to judge is to judge not of some, but all, to know not simply the truth,

but all the truth, if you are going to pass real judgment upon what has been done.

Now, perhaps at no place in this Government does there come in the course of time more information, scattered and from many directions, but still more information touching the prosecution of this war, than at the committee table of the Committee on Appropriations, because that committee last fall made all the war appropriations, and this year it has had to consider, as it always has considered, deficiencies; and in considering deficiencies, of necessity you have had to consider the various activities of the different departments. Men get impressions as the result of months of testimony and talk with many men. I have some impressions touching this war and touching the country's condition. There are so many men who have volunteered to play the rôle of critics and of panegyrists that it does not seem necessary for me to adopt either rôle. and I shall not attempt it to-day. But it may not be amiss if I should state what to my mind consitutes the great problem in the efficient prosecution of this war and on the doing of which will depend from now on how well or how badly we play our Three words describe three things involved, and they are all intimately linked together-ships, cars, storage.

The latter, people have not thought a great deal of, and yet it is one of the things that has served to accentuate the difficulties relative to the other two. If you have a superabundance of cargo space, and if you have a rail transportation system more than adequate, storage becomes a negligible proposition. But to the extent that either rail transportation or occur transportation is deficient, to that extent does storage become of the first importance, because if it be deficient it simply serves to put an added burden upon rail and ocean transportation and to make even greater the deficiency in those two branches.

Now, that is what has occurred in large measure in connection with this war. This country has not had for the past 10 years or more an adequate transportation system-rail transportation system-and it was perfectly apparent to every thoughtful man-and if you will hunt through the files of debates here and of speeches elsewhere you will find that time and time again attention has been ealled to the fact-that whenever this country got into the full tide of prosperity and of economic development and of output the rail transportation would prove totally inadequate. Well, the rail transportation was not only called upon to deal with what might be called the output of ordinary good times, but it was required to deal with an expansion such as the country had never known. been expanding in manufacture here in America before we went into the war, and since to an extent never dreamen of before, and that in turn has made an output vastly greater-a tonnage output-than what existed shortly prior to that, when there had been a lessening of industrial activity in the country.

In connection with that absence of rail transportation facilities was an antiquated system of storage and of wharfage and port facilities. We never have had for many decades a great ocean carrying fleet, the reasons for which are manifold, and I will not now undertake to speak of them; but everyone was conscious of the fact that the country was sorely lacking in ships, and, of course, with the tremendous falling off of tonnage caused by the depredations of the U-boats the tomage of the world has become inadequate, and of necessity that presented a problem of first importance.

Now, we had the railroads unequal to their burden; we had unequal storage facilities, and we had a lack of ships,

This was not any particular person's fault; certainly it was not any political party's fault that has been in power only the last few years. But as a result of it, railroad cars became warehouses and piers became warehouses; sheds and piers that were meant to be used for the loading and unloading of freight were used as warehouses for the storage of freight, and there began to pile up thousands and thousands of tons of freight at our eastern seaboard. The situation was made worse by virtue of several other matters. The industrial activity of this country, speaking by and large, is confined in one geographical section. In a big sense the East, the Northeast, and a little section of the Middle West represent the great manufacturing section of America, and as a result of it, it was natural that for an immediate, quick output you had to go into that section.

What has been the result? The result has been that you have

placed in three or four States of the Union the great majority of the war orders of the Government. You have added conges-tion there and a burden there upon transportation that served to disrupt and interfere with transportation everywhere else. That involved your fuel problem. It brought a problem so acute that it was necessary to turn in and take drastic action relative

to the use and transportation of coal.

I hold in my hand an outline map of the United States. Gentlemen will see a lot of dots at different places which indicate various contracts for war material that have been placed What does it show? It shows that out of twentyin America. three hundred odd firms, holding about fifty-odd thousand important war contracts of the Government, a fourth are in New York State, half are in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and three-fourths are in seven States. Is it any wonder that you have a labor problem that is involving the best thought of America in order that these factories may continue their output without diminution?

Is it any wonder that you got a congestion of freight as a result of that? And yet that was not altogether a matter that could have been prevented.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

HARDY. In the gentleman's opinion does not that same condition accentuate the housing problem that is now one of the important questions confronting the Government?

Mr. SHERLEY. Why, yes. That was part of what I meant

by the labor problem.

Mr. HARDY. In other words, we ought to try to decentralize some of this Government industry?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is easier to say, perhaps, than to do. Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Before the gentleman gets away from this subject of storage in railroad cars, has he any information as to the number of cars that are now held on sidetracks as warehouses?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I have not. I was unable to go into that detail. I am afraid I have gone into so much detail now in the hearings that I am liable to make the mistake that I was accusing the Congress of making-thinking too much of little things and not enough of big ones.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois. Let me say, I have read somewhere

that there were 700,000 cars held for storage purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not really know, and, of course, the number would change from day to day. My understanding is that there has recently been a very great relief of the situation, due to the drastic action that was taken in connection with fuel; and I know from a talk I had not later than this morning that the conditions at the seaboard are very greatly improved, and that steps are actually being taken which warrant the assertion that that situation, to the extent that it is solvable—because there are certain conditions which you can not change—is being solved.

Mr. SNYDER. I should like to say to the gentleman, how-ever, that I have just come back from central New York, and the embargo conditions up there are exactly the same as they have been for the past five or six weeks. There has been practically no relief there.

Mr. SHERLEY. That may be; but again I suggest that you have to look at the whole picture and not at one part of it. You can take a dime and hold it close enough to your eye to

shut out the entire hor!zon. Mr. FOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FOSS. Does not the gentleman think a mistake has been made in shipping goods from the point of production down to the eastern seaboard before they were ready to put them on board the ships, thereby congesting a large amount of goods in the East here?

Mr. SHERLEY. In some measure that is true.

Thereby necessitating the building of these Mr. FOSS. warehouses

Mr. SHERLEY. In a measure that is true. Yet it is only fair to say that some of the very manufacturing firms in the gentleman's country and elsewhere have been 'insisting that they be permitted to ship goods so as to get them out of their way so that they could go on producing others. It is so easy to stand here looking backward and say, "This, that, or the other thing should have been done"; but we all learn by ex-One of the real problems has been to coordinate production with transportation facilities, both by rail and by water, and in turn to coordinate transportation facilities with men-with men at the front.

The critic in one breath wants to know why you do not put more men across the water. He rarely knows how many men are there, or how many men are going, but the less he knows about either fact the more he cries out, "Why are they not going across the water?" And then in the next breath he wants to know why on earth you congest the

across the water determine the amount of freight that has to go to the coast and how fast it has to go there. These things are tied together in such a way that it is not easy to solve them. Now, there is in this bill an appropriation of \$100,000,000, with a contract authorization of \$50,000,000, for the purpose of acquiring storage facilities on the Atlantic coast and in the in-Gen. Goethals, who is now in charge of the Quartermaster's Department, and is also an acting member of the staff in charge of storage, came before the committee with a proposition looking to the expenditure of that amount of money. He very frankly stated that he was not prepared to give to the committee all of the details of that proposal, but as a member of the New York Port and Harbor Development Commission he had become familiar particularly with conditions there, and he and other gentlemen were making studies of conditions genand other gentlemen were making studies of conditions generally, and he said it was perfectly apparent that that amount, and probably a greater amount of money, would be needed in order to create the proper storage facilities. I want to say in passing that some of this work is going on now, and that this remedy is not awaiting the passage of this bill, for which I am glad.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is the storage problem acute on foreign shores?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is a problem there, but it is separate from what I am talking about now. I shall be glad to speak of it a little later.

The committee did not undertake to limit or to tie the expenditure of this amount of money. We were not in a position, and I do not think Congress is in a position, to determine where and how the storage facilities should be acquired; but we propose, in the voting of this money, that the administrative officers may have the means, and then upon them will rest the responsibility of supplying the country with proper storage facilities. The plan as stated by Gen. Goethals was only tentative, and therefore was subject to some revision, and I understand informally has received some revision. It looked to 30 days' storage capacity at the coast and six months' or less capacity in the interior. That is tied to a plan touching transportation of troops abroad, and I do not feel that I ought to undertake to enumerate in detail the amount of material and supplies that they should carry with them; but it is hoped and believed that this will result in giving us such storage facilities as will make unnecessary undue delays in transportation by rail or by boat. It requires but a moment's thought to realize that if in the loading of a vessel you take two or three days longer than you ought, or if in the unloading of it you take two or three days longer than you ought, you have to just that extent reduced the number of ships you have in over-seas transportation, and to any extent that you can accelerate the loading and unloading of ships, to that extent you have added to your tonnage, because you make more trips possible with the same ships.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did the committee consider the wisdom or unwisdom of concentrating this storage business at one port along the coast of the United States?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; the committee did not. The committee did not believe—perhaps that is putting it too broad—but I do not believe I have sufficient capacity or the time to qualify me to pass upon that matter. The statement was made in the hearings that in a large measure six different ports would be developed for the use of the Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is a general impression that the concentration of the war business of the country at one port has been responsible for much of our transportation difficulties.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true, and it is also true that that impression usually represents nothing but the selfishness of a locality not favored. There is an impression abroad that there locality not favored is too much shipbuilding in Philadelphia. I do not share that belief, but that is the impression caused by the greed of other localities that would like the business; and it is that same sort or narrow viewpoint that makes men complain, without looking at the whole picture, because their locality does not happen to be the favored locality.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There may be some natural advantages elsewhere, apart from other reasons. Why should other points, like Charleston, Savannah, Norfolk, Jacksonville, Baltimore, Boston, and Philadelphia be left out of consideration?

Mr. SHERLEY. In the first place, the gentleman has assumed a premise which I do not think exists, and, in the second place, if I was able to answer him I would know the whole problem, freight at your ports of embarkation. The men who go and I do not. I do not know what place ought to be used; I

have not the information and could not get it short of six months' study

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has been said here-the gentleman did not say it—that as much as \$25,000,000 might be

spent in extending the storage facilities at one port. Mr. SHERLEY. I would not be at all surprised, and I have

no doubt it would be justified. If the gentleman will permit, I will read him the ports that are going to be used. I will say this, further, to him, that, whether he likes it or does not, you can not possibly take away the primacy of New York as a great port of embarkation. You can not do it, not simply because of the port, but you can not do it on account of the trade conditions and the rail conditions and a lot of other things that can not be changed overnight. It may be, and probably is, exceedingly unfortunate for war purposes that there grew up in America transportation methods and systems and ports and cities without relationship to war needs, but they have; and, these facts being so, we can not run away from them, and men who start to criticize ought to remember them in their criticisms.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman pardon me for one more question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, I do not mean my answer to apply

personally to the gentleman from Pennsylvania-Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand that. raise the question of the wisdom of this concentration. It seemed to me a fair question whether it is wise, from a governmental viewpoint or from a military standpoint, to concentrate all shipping business at one place. The possibility of the enemy making an attack on that point adds to the seriousness of the question.

Mr. SHERLEY. I question whether that is a matter that the Committee on Appropriations could decide. I do not think it could come to a wise conclusion, for it has not the means. I read from the hearings, page 503, where Gen. Goethals says:

In the general scheme, as I have outlined it, we contemplate using Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, Newport News as a part of the Norfolk scheme, and Charleston.

I am assuming that Gen. Goethals and the gentlemen associated with him, men distinguished for their achievements in private business life, have worked out a scheme that is proper and practicable. If they have not, we are that much to the worse; but I am satisfied that a better one can not be worked out by legislative enactment.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does not that scheme involve practically the utter neglect of every port west of the Mississippi River and, in fact, west of Florida?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I think it does, in a large measure. Mr. HARDY. Would not that leave the transportation that ought naturally to come down the western section of the country for export, leave it unprovided for, and tend to congest-the very thing that the gentleman complains of?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I think not; and for the very plain reason that if the gentleman will take a map and draw the distance from Galveston or New Orleans to France, then draw a line from Charleston, one from Baltimore, one from Philadelphia, one from Boston, I think he will get his answer, bearing in mind that the longer a ship takes to go across the sea the less number of trips it can make.

Mr. HARDY. But if you are so congested with freight in the eastern ports that you can not get the ships unloaded, you have

destroyed your transportation.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, if you can not move it out of New York, you had better move it at New Orleans, but this \$150,000,000 is to make it more expeditious to move it to these various ports and to get it across the water.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHERLEY, I will. Mr. SNYDER. I was in New York the other day talking with quite a number of men on this very subject, and they said that there was a considerable quantity of munitions passing through New York that they would be glad to have passed through the port of Philadelphia,

Mr. SHERLEY. All I can say, and I do not want to seem discourteous—as I may seem to have been in my desire to be emphatic—I think this problem will be worked out by those who have the time and who have the information very much better than we can hope to work it out on the floor of Con-

Mr. LONGWORTH. Before the gentleman leaves this subject of unloading ships, I want to say that he may recollect the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], which came under his personal observation, that the unloading of a ship of steel goods at a port in France took 60 days.

Mr. SHERLEY. That is possible, and one of the reasons was that in the loading of that ship on this side it was loaded without any real knowledge of the problem of unloading it, or, even if the knowledge existed, without the facilities to get it loaded properly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That ship could probably have made

two complete trips in that time.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I think that one of the problems that the War Department now has under serious consideration is the unloading of ships across the water, and that, too, is complicated by the fact that their port facilities are very limited.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am aware of that, and we are carrying moneys for that in this bill. Part of the moneys being provided for the Engineer Department are for the purpose of improving facilities abroad in the unloading of ships and in the transportation and movement to the front of the munitions that go there. That illustrates another proposition, that the same men who now as critics complain about the lack of port facilities in France are the same distinguished gentlemen who insisted upon putting fighting men on the front, and who interfered by their agitation with the orderly plan of developing facilities for handling troops before you put the troops there in great mass. You can not eat your cake and have it, too. You can not do certain things except at the expense of other things, and there has been much childish and unreasoning criticism by men who have insisted on a thing being done without realizing that when done it prevented something else of equal or greater importance. that is to be expected because we are dealing with big matters that are beyond the ken of most of us, and mistakes necessarily are made, and mistakes are imagined when they are not made.

I want to pass now from this desultory statement, touching what I believe to be, as I have stated, the most important phase of our war problem, to a consideration of the details of the bill The estimates as submitted to Congress amounted in the way of appropriations and authorizations to \$1,635,792,341.64. The total of the amount of appropriations and authorizations granted is \$528,572,259.18 less than that sum. The amount of direct appropriations is \$907,397,259.18 less than the amount of direct appropriations requested, and the amount of authorizations granted is \$378.825,000 more than the amount of authorizations requested. That means that we have very greatly cut the amount of money appropriated and we have considerably in-

creased the amount of contract authorizations. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky

has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one hour more, in the hope that I shall not use it all. Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may continue until he concludes his remarks.

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope to do that within one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to proceed for one hour more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. As I stated, we have increased the authorizations and decreased the cash, but we have decreased both authorizations and cash by more than \$500,000,000. It is proper that some general explanation should be given of so marked a cut as that. Let me say in advance that that cut, in the judgment of the committee, is made without in any sense impairing in the slightest degree the efficient prosecution of the war. No moneys anywhere were denied for any purpose that it was be-lieved were necessary for the prosecution of the war, and no member of the committee permitted any belief or hope as to an early termination of the war to control him in voting, because, manifestly, no more fatal mistake could be made than to undertake to act upon the belief that the war might end at an earlier period than the facts may warrant.

Mr. MADDEN. How does the gentleman account for the wide difference of opinion between the executive heads of the Government and the committee on the matter of the amount of money

needed?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am going to explain that in a moment. Two hundred and ninety million dollars of that cut is represented in a clothing estimate, which was not allowed for this reason. But little if any of that money will be needed prior to the 1st of July, and this bill is a deficiency bill to make provision for the needs of the various departments up to July 1.

Mr. MADDEN rose.

Mr. SHERLEY. In just a moment. I think I will anticipate the question. The Army and the Navy have a right to incur deficiencies to any amount necessary in connection with clothing and are ordering and have ordered all the clothing that is believed necessary. Therefore, the giving of this amount would have no value in speeding up in the slightest degree the matter

of clothing, and it was thought desirable that the actual amount that should be necessary to pay the clothing bill should be left to the consideration of the Committee on Military Affairs, that deals with it under our present system, in connection with the Army bill, or if by chance later on it is necessary to consider it as a deficiency, there will be of necessity another defi-ciency bill, when the Appropriations Committee could do so more accurately than now, so we just cut it out of this bill entirely. I now yield to the gentleman.

In view of the general information that is in Mr. MADDEN. the possession of everyone to the effect that most of the men in the cantonments have only one suit of clothes and only one pair of shoes, it would seem as if it would be very wise to allow the money so that they could pay for the shoes and the clothing they have to have in order to supply the needed cloth-

ing to the men who are already short.

Mr. SHERLEY. It would seem so, if either of the gentleman's statements was warranted by the situation, but they are not in my judgment. I do not think conditions are anything like what the gentleman states touching either shoes or clothing, but if they were the refusal of an appropriation of this money would not interfere one iota with the procurement of one shoe or one shoe lace or one coat or button on a coat, and if the gentleman will think for just a moment touching the power that exists in the Army and Navy to incur deficiencies for clothing purposes he will realize that my statement is true.

Mr. MADDEN. I realize that, if the gentleman will allow me, but at the same time they ought to be paid for the things

Mr. SHERLEY. They will be. Their bills will not come in until after July. I have not heard of any clothing manufacturer who was not being paid if his bill was properly presented and audited. There is plenty of cash in the Treasury available for that purpose now. Now, to go on with the items showing cuts. Armories and arsenals, there was a cut of two and a half million dollars, and that is due to the elimination of certain matters which on reconsideration by the department were not pressed at this time and do not represent any real denial of moneys for any needed facilities. Transportation of the Army was cut \$70,000,000, and it was cut that amount because of facts which were presented touching the probable transportation of men. It was not believed the amount was needed that was asked to the extent of \$70,000,000. That is necessarily an estimate. Nobody can estimate accurately, but it had to be based somewhat upon the transportation that had taken place during the past six months and on the estimate of the next six months. Obviously, the amount for transportation the first six months would not be needed in the second because of the cost the first six months of assembling of all of our, present Army, but if more moneys are needed for that purpose it will be met as needed. There is some transportation that can be a matter of abuse, and it was thought wise that Congress should appropriate what seemed to be a sufficient amount without putting moneys at the disposal of the department beyond what was needed.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. TILSON. Does this transportation money apply to the moving of enlisted men between now and the 1st of July?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

TILSON. Is the gentleman taking into consideration the possibility of the next draft being earlier than the 1st of July?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. That was part of the theory on which the whole item was based. Whether we have made a correct conclusion is difficult to say, but that item was presented, as I recall, by Col. Daly, of the War Department, and the cut that we made represents an agreed judgment of his and the committee, and if it be an error it is one that will be corrected without difficulty.

Mr. TILSON. As a matter of fact, I was trying to get at whether the gentleman had any information or whether it is possible at this time to tell whether the draft would be made the 1st of May or the 1st of July, and that might make a large dif-

ference in this item.

Mr. SHERLEY. My impression is, and I would not like to say it was more than an impression, that it contemplated that a draft would be made prior to July. Of course, not the calling in of all of these men but some portion of them. But that is just an impression, and I may be in error, because the gentleman will appreciate there is a lot of testimony that goes out of one's

Mr. TILSON. I am perfectly aware that it is not probably known by anybody whether that will be done at one time or another.

Mr. SHERLEY. Storage and shipping facilities. There is a

in large measure of estimates. I have spoken of the appropriation of \$100,000,000 with \$50,000,000 authorization to the Quartermaster General for this purpose. His estimate was made after some estimates had been made and submitted in detail for storage at various places, and the bigger scheme swallowed up

the smaller, and this \$35,000,000 was deducted.

There were construction items under the quartermaster, \$85,000,000. Some of them represented real cuts where the committee did not believe that the amount was needed. instance, I recal an item of \$2,000,000 for painting cantonments. The committee thought if provision was made for painting the outside of the cantonments and a certain amount of interior work it was all that was necessary, and we did not need to spend all the money that was asked for painting both inside and outside of these wooden buildings as a manner of preservation of them, particularly in view of the fact that nobody at this time was in a position to say for how long these cantonments would be There was an item of heating of garages for motor vehicles, \$3,000,000. The committee did not allow it because before this bill can become a law and long before these heating plants could be had, the weather itself will make unnecessary any heat for the garages. Now, this coming winter it may be necessary to heat some of these garages to prevent freezing both of water and gasoline in the tanks of many of these motors that are housed there and to enable men to work in them. But that was a matter which could go over. It was not so pressing as to be work that needs to be done now, as contemplated in a deficiency bill that provides only to July 1. There were some repairs at some camps which were cut, some items as to repair shops, where we did not think that a sufficient case was made to warrant the increase of facilities at those camps in that particular. There was a cut of a half a million in the operation of camp There was a request for an additional cantonment of utilities. \$8,185,000 and a cantonment for Ordnance personnel of \$4,460,000 that were eliminated because there was nobody at this time prepared to state where they were to be and when they were needed.

There was a cut touching refrigerator plants of \$5,000,000, because that is carried in the lump-sum appropriation touching storage facilities There was for military posts and exchanges a cut of \$250,000; barracks and quarters, seacoast posts, a cut of \$2,209,000, which represents that much error in the presentation of the estimates, which were checked up and caught up by the gentleman presenting the estimates and the committee.

In the Medical Department there has been an allowance

practically of everything that is asked.

The Army Medical Corps figured originally, I believe—or perhaps it might be more accurate to state that provision was originally made-for a 3 per cent capacity in hospitals at the various camps and cantonments-3 per cent of the total cajacity of the camps and cantonments. The Surgeon General's Department seemed to believe that 5 per cent is now necessary in order to make assurance doubly sure against the sickness that might arise in connection with the training of men in these various camps and cantonments. They also estimated on the basis of 5 per cent capacity to take care of in this country the troops that might be overseas and facilities of 20 per cent capacity to take care overseas of the troops there. The Navy has a large program in the way of hospital facilities, and the Marine Public Health Service have another one. If it related to anything except the health and lives of the boys that are fighting for their country, this committee would have recom-mended, I have no doubt, considerable cuts in those estimates. It is not always that you find a highly skilled medical officer who also is a fine business man. And the problem confronting the committee in connection with these estimates was not an We solve it by allowing what was asked, because that solution was along the line of safety for the lives and health of the boys. And perhaps that is about as explanatory a statement as can be made touching the estimates submitted by the various medical departments of the Government.

Mr. TILSON. I wish to ask in regard to just one detail. Does the gentleman's bill carry anything for sewage for hospi-

tals at the National Guard camps?

Mr. SHERLEY. My impression is that it does. Mr. TILSON. My observation in those camps leads me to believe that that was the thing most needed of all, namely, the sewage disposition from the hospitals of National Guard camps. Mr. SHERLEY. It carries everything that the medical men

are able to think of.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Is it all contained in this medical

department?

Mr. SHERLEY. There are some \$18,000,000 contained in the way of construction, repairs, and enlargements of hospitals for the Army. There is quite a considerable sum, several millions cut there of \$35,000,000, and that was really due to a duplication of dollars, in the way of enlargement of marine hospitals, under the Public Health Service, and quite a sum in this regard for There are the items that are carried under the head of barracks and quarters, and water, sewers, roads and streets, and things of that kind, that would also relate directly or indirectly to matters of sanitation. Then there are certain items touching sanitation of areas outside of camps under the Public Health Service.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I just observed that the items referred to were not in the medical department.

Mr. TOWNER. I notice in the item of water and sewers at military posts the appropriation is over \$13,000,000. I will ask

the gentleman if that includes cantonments?

Mr. SHERLEY. It includes more than that. These are items that have been allowed. I say "allowed," but it does not very much matter whether the committee thought it ought to be allowed or not. The money has been spent and the thing done, and we are simply paying the bill. I am not saying that in criticism. It is already spent, and ought to have been done. because these things were things of first importance, but manifestly when it came to the committee as a proposition of money spent we had no option as to whether we would vote it or not.

There has been estimated here \$30,424,175 under the various heads of barracks and quarters, waters and sewers, regular supplies, roads, walks, wharves, and drainage, construction and repair of hospitals, at the 16 cantonments, and there had been under the similar heads a total of \$18,353,194 at the various Then there are a number of items under the same head that relate to work done at other places outside of these

16 cantonments and 16 camps.

Mr. TOWNER. Those are included in other items in the bill? Mr. SHERLEY. No. "Barracks and quarters" is only carried once in the bill, and it represents money used for cantonments and camps, and also for other purposes. There was submitted to the committee, as the result of a suggestion made at the hearing last fall, a table that undertook to segregate and group these matters, and it is from that table that I have been endeavoring to read.

Perhaps there are some other cuts that ought to be enumerated as being of sufficient magnitude to deserve attention at this time.

In the Provost Marshal's office there was a cut of \$2,000,000. That \$2,000,000 was a cut because of a request of that amount to reimburse the President's fund, and that brings up a subject that it is well to speak of generally. The President very properly, as occasion arose from time to time in various departments, has advanced moneys to carry on necessary activities. As a very good illustration of that, the War-Risk Insurance Bureau was created by an act of Congress, passed a few days, or a week, maybe, before Congress adjourned. Of necessity no adequate provision could be made by Congress for taking care of that organization. It has grown and is growing, and will continue to grow, by leaps and bounds. It was necessary for the President to advance \$500,000 to be used for that bureau in the employment of clerks and procurement of space, and other purposes incident to the organization of the bureau.

So in the case of the Provost Marshal's office, \$2,000,000 was advanced; in other bureaus, lesser sums. In some instances, as in these two, requests were made for us to appropriate sums in order that that fund might be reimbursed. The committee concluded not to do that in any instance presented here, not in the slightest as a criticism of the President's use of the fund, for so far as it has come to the attention of the committee there has been no disposition on the part of the Executive to give funds indiscriminately and without thought; but because of a realization that of necessity the President could not watch all of the details, and that it was not intended that the \$100,000,000 fund should be a revolving fund, always to be kept at that amount, but was given for the purpose of meeting exigencies as they arose, and that if subsequently there came such a diminution of it as to make it desirable the President should be voted additional sums, Congress would unhesitatingly do it. Congress and any Congress will always vote to the President of the United States the moneys necessary to meet situations such as this when the country is engaged in war; and, to the great credit of the country, it has never had a President that did not deserve that confidence at the hands of the legislative branch of the Government. [Applause.] But just as a matter of keeping track of things, in order to prevent departments undertaking to get from the President moneys and then spending them w)thout getting the viewpoint of Congress at all, and then coming to Congress and asking that the money be given back by which it could reimburse the President, the committee thought it wise not to recommend such sums, and has not done so.

That explains that cut of \$2,000,000 in connection with the Provost Marshal's office.

In the Food and Fuel Administrations there was a cut of \$250,000. That is a joint fund, and while both Mr. Garfield

and Mr. Hoover expressed the belief and the desire that the fund should be separated and the two departments carried separately in the future, and while the committee believed that that is a proper thing to do, it did not feel like doing it in a deficiency bill when in a few weeks the matter will come up for a more minute examination in connection with the sundry civil bill. We cut the amount asked for because we believed that they did not need the full amount asked. It was not cut with the idea of restricting their activities, but certain estimates were made on the basis of an increased salary roll for a six months' period. This bill will not become a law until, at the best, about four months before the end of the period. Manifestly in many instances there should have been a cut of onethird in connection with salaries and expenses of that sort. In that way will be explained many of these cuts.

Now, there are a great number of other items that come from all the different departments of the Government. It is a time when the war, like charity, is made to cover a multitude of sins, and when a department, whether it has any relationship to the war or not, is glad to take war as an excuse for getting moneys for increasing its activities. So far as we could we tried to check those things, and where we thought moneys were

being asked that were not necessary we cut them.

There were certain deficiencies that were perfectly patent. There is quite a deficiency here in regard to soldiers' homes, which was allowed in its ent'rety. It grew out of the increased cost of food and fuel. It did not require very much of argument to convince anybody who has to pay his own bills that it was costing the Government more money to pay its bills in regard to both food and fuel, and those matters became matters of mathematical calculation in large measure.

There was an estimate of \$6,000,000 to furnish seeds to the farmers of the country at cost. That was submitted to the committee and was cut \$2,000,000. It was cut \$2,000,000 because of a belief that with the \$2,500,000 which they have available, and which was voted them last fall, and with the \$4,000,-000 which will be made available through the passage of this bill they would have as large a fund as was needed. fund is a revolving fund. One of the questions that came up was how far they would be able to turn over the money. Manifestly they will begin buying right away the seed, and manifestly they will have to sell that seed very shortly, the time being shorter or longer according as the planting season is earlier in one section and later in another section. To a lim'ted extent seeds sold where planting is very early will be sold early enough for the money obtained from those sales to be again used in the purchase of new seeds, and to that extent the fund can be made to go further than its total would indicate. how far that may be it is 'mpossible to tell. But believing that there would be some of that, and believing that the estimates proposed were based on a belief a little more gloomy than the facts warranted, because there is always too much rain, or too little, and the weather is never quite right for farming, and things are always going wrong, and st'll do not always go quite as badly wrong as folks think [laughter], the committee felt warranted in making the reduction indicated.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman

vield there?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that in October out in Michigan it rained 28 days out of 31.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no doubt of that, and I have no doubt that the frost has killed all the fruit. It always does. [Laugh-

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I can say to the gentleman that it has killed a good deal of the wheat.

Mr. SHERLEY. I recognize that; and because it was a concrete situation we undertook to deal liberally with the de-There are sections where the selection and adaptapartment. tion of certain kinds of wheat and cotton and sorghum are such as to make difficult the procurement of the proper kind of seed, and it is perfectly manifest that the Government must now go into this activity. I also believe it likely that the Government will not lose anything by this expenditure, and that the sales of these seeds shall be as the law contemplates they should be, at such price as to cover the cost of procurement and the actual distribution cost and overhead charge. I would not ordinarily like even this plan of State socialism, but facts are facts, and facts are stubborn things, and we are doing many things now in this war that I hope and believe none of us will be doing or wanting to do, unless it be my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. London], in the days that will come after peace is declared.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am sure that the action of the committee in this regard will be appreciated very much by the farmers, who are trying under these circumstances to produce

sufficient crops to serve the needs of the country. But I would like to inquire whether it would be proper for the gentleman to state how the seed will be sold, so that the farmers can avail themselves of it. Will it be sold by the Secretary of Agriculture direct to the farmer or will it be placed in seed houses in the different States so that the purchases can be made through them?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, we did not go into the question fully as to the method of distribution. We did make an inquiry which I think is interesting, and which I think the gentleman will enjoy reading, touching the method of acquiring information as to the amount of seed needed and the method of procurement of the right sort of seed for sale and distribution. I assume that the Agricultural Department will through its own agencies undertake to distribute this seed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentle-

man permit a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose it would be very much like the system developed about the distribution of nitrate

Mr. SHERLEY. I would assume that is true.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yesterday I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, asking about the matter the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am sure you will get more accurate and fuller information from the Secretary than from me.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.
Mr. TEMPLE. Is it expected to get the bill through both Houses and signed in time for use of the seed in the spring-

Mr. SHERLEY. I hope to get it through the House by Saturday, and I hope it can be passed through the Senate within a week. There is \$2,500,000 now that the Secretary has, and, of course, it can be used for the immediate needs, pending these other moneys. Now, gentlemen, I have already taken more time than I expected to. I want to speak to the committee about one matter of great importance.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.
Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I want to ask a question about the policy of the committee. I observe that it has reduced the immediate appropriation, but granted quite liberal authorizations. Is not that unusual in a deficiency bill, to grant such authorizations?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; it would be; but this is not a usual deficiency bill. What I mean is that many of the deficiencies are of a different character. We are making contracts in large sums. For instance, the engineers wanted \$140,000,000. We gave them \$70,000,000 in cash and \$70,000,000 authorization, and we did it upon this theory, that while it was necessary for the Engineer Department to be in a position to incur obligations of the Government and let contracts for the procurement of locomotives, rails, and other facilities, amounting to a total of \$140,000,000, by no possibility could the bills be presented by July 1. In that connection I will say that the Engineer Department has unpledged a free balance of \$114,000,000 and we gave them \$70,000,000 more, making \$184.000,000 cash, which is more money than they can possibly need to pay bills between now and July 1, and other appropriations could be made afterwards without now tying the Treasury. It is an unfortunate thing to tie the Treasury by positive appropriations to any greater extent than necessary. That was the general relief the convention of the convent eral policy the committee followed.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Then the authorizations are for contracts between now and July 1?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; while it is a continuing authorization, we were advised that they expected to enter into the contracts before July 1.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The same department asked the Military Committee for \$800,000,000 for the year beginning the

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; but the committee did not undertake to deal with matters that will probably come before the gentleman's committee touching the fiscal year 1919.

Mr. WHALEY. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.
Mr. WHALEY. Is the nitrate of soda fund to be made a re-

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; and the reason for that was developed from a statement contained in a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, that while there was some uncertainty whether he would be able to get ships in order to get additional nitrates, still it was desirable that the fund should be a revolving fund during the war. The committee, realizing that that was true,

felt warranted in presenting legislation to that extent, and it contained in the bill.

Now, gentlemen, one of the problems that confronted the committee, and which was the most difficult in many ways of solution, was the problem in connection with the building program for the District of Columbia. I said awhile ago that it was very much easier to look back and see mistakes than to look forward and see needs. I think one of the big mistakes that Congress made—and perhaps nobody was more responsible for that mistake than myself, unless it was the distinguished gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald-was that instead of building 1,000,000 square feet of space last year in Henry Park we ought to have built three or four million square feet. We probably would have been denied the request if we had come in with a suggestion of that kind, but that is what ought to have been done. We ought to have taken certain land then available and placed on it buildings to the extent of three or four million square feet of space, and as a result of that we would have had a building plan that would have been more uniform, more permanent, and more desirable than what has taken

place and what is now going to take place.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the War Department, or whatever department has jurisdiction, lived within the estimate of the cost of \$2,000,000?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not entirely; there has been put into this building a sprinkler system in order to lessen, as far as practicable, the danger of fire.

Mr. MADDEN. They would not be able to get insurance un-

less they did.

Mr. SHERLEY. They do not have any insurance, but it is to lessen the fire danger. By virtue of that fact and some other minor things there have been expenses which will carry the cost of the building over \$2 a square foot, which was the estimate, to \$2.16 a square foot; and, so, to that extent they have not kept within their appropriation. But that is less than we can build wooden buildings for to-day. In the items we are carrying in the bill for wooden buildings we are figuring on a basis of \$2.25 a square foot.

Now, there is at present, occupied by various departments of the Government, 3,826,511 square feet of rented space, or, rather, there was on the 1st of January. This matter changes from day to day and it will keep a man busy to keep up with the changes, but the committee sent out a series of questions to every department and has compiled information as to that data touching rentals. For that space the Government is now paying \$1,764,019.40 annual rental. The space obtained lately is. costing a dollar or more a square foot. Now, the estimate of space needed by the departments prior to July 1 is 2,109,761 square feet, and that means net.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Mr. SLOAN. As to the value of buildings occupied by the Government, can the gentleman state about what percentage of the value of the building is paid in rentals?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I can not state from my knowledge what that would be. We are paying now, I should say, what a president of a railroad many years ago described as "all the traffic will bear." It is so much higher in some instances that you do not like to think of the extortion.

But they have asked all that they could get, and are still prepared to do so. There is figured as additional space after July and up to the next July of 2,316,270 square feet. The committee has presented a proposal here that has one vice. It is inadequate, but again the committee tried to keep within what would seem to a good many people reasonable bounds. I say inadequate because if this war continues for more than this year, the expansion is going to be away beyond even what that table indicates

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Mr. MADDEN. Of course, if these buildings are of a temorary character, or even if they be of a permanent character, they could be so laid out as to extend them without any additional expense in the cost per cubic foot, so that if you prepare for just what you know you need now and you lay your plans for additions that may meet the future needs you would be perfectly safe.

Mr. SHERLEY. I agree with the gentleman, if we do that, but unfortunately we think we do it when we do not. Right now the departments are being handicapped, seriously handicapped, for the lack of at least a million square feet of space, that ought to be available this moment, and that is understating the situation. But you know it is hard for men to expand in their minds as fast as events expand for them, and we did not want to bring in here a proposal that looks too extravagant.

Mr. MADDEN. Sometimes what looks to be the most extravagant is the most economical,

Mr. SHERLEY. That is true.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the gentleman been able to obtain any information as to the length of time it will require to complete the character of buildings the committee recommend for con-

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I am going into all that detail in a moment, which I hope will give the gentleman the information What we are proposing is that there shall be erected in Seaton Park-and Seaton Park is that part of the Mall that lies immediately to the east of Henry Park, and Henry Park is that part of the Mall where these buildings that were ordered built last year now are, at Sixth and D Streets—that at Seaton Park there shall be constructed one concrete building of 270,000 square feet, and when I speak of square feet I am speaking of gross, not including the walls, but gross in the sense of including halls and other space not used commonly as offices. It is inside

Besides this 270,000 square feet of concrete in Seaton Park, we propose also 370,000 square feet of wooden buildings, all to be three stories in height, the wooden buildings to be of the same style as the buildings now in Henry Park, and the concrete building to be reinforced concrete of a plain design, three stories high, and, of course, entirely fireproof. Then, just beyond the present Henry Park buildings to the west it is proposed to put up a wooden building of 300,000 square feet of space. would make in that part of the Mall an addition of 940,000 square feet of floor space. The reason for putting one concrete square feet of floor space. The reason for putting one concrete building there was this: Those buildings in Henry Park are now largely used, not entirely, by the ordnance people. Practically a third of those buildings are reserved for the use of the Navy, and they are to give that up under the new plan, which proposes building them a concrete building at Seventeenth and B Streets, to which I shall come in a few moments

It is evident that the ordnance people will eventually need all of the present space at Henry Park, and will need, in addition to that, considerable concrete space for the certain protection of their records, their drafting force, and drawings. do not believe that there is any real fire risk in the sense of danger to human life in connection with those buildings. The policing of those buildings, the fire protection in the way of the sprinkler system and otherwise is such, together with the character of the building, which would enable, in case of emergency, the rapid emptying of them, even in case of fire, that there would be no great danger to the people stationed within them.

But there is a fire risk in connection with the records. people could get out but the records would not get out, and there would be as much delay by virtue of the destruction of certain classes of drawings and records as could possibly come to us in the prosecution of the war. It is therefore highly important that we should have a concrete building there, and if it was not because of the time involved I should favor building only concrete buildings from now on. But the War Department needs immediately a great deal of space. They have stated that if we could supply very shortly some six or seven hundred thousand square feet of space, that that would take care of the acute phase of the situation until we get further relief from the concrete buildings that we are proposing, and so it was planned in

It is proposed at Seventeenth and B Streets-and that is right across from the Pan American Union Building-to place two buildings, one for the Army and one for the Navy, running west toward the river, that shall have a total floor space of 1,775,000 square feet, 940,000 square feet to be for the use of the Navy and 835,000 square feet for the use of the Army. The Navy Building will be sufficient to take care of all of the Navy activities with its prospective expansion, save only that space now occupied in the Navy Annex and for which they have a lease of some years. It might even take care of that, if need be, and that lease might be transferred for the use of other departments. As a result of building these buildings they state that they are able and willing to stay in the present quarters, crowded though they are, and to immediately release for the use of the Army the approximately 300,000 square feet, gross area, down at Henry Park, and so the plan contemplates their release of that and the immediate use of it—it ought to be ready in a few days—by the Army. By this plan the Navy sub-sequently can, and will, release practically all of the space it now has in the Army and Navy Building for the use of the State Department, which is greatly in need of additional space. After completion of all the buildings here proposed there should be such release of rented space by the Navy and War Departments

as would enable other bureaus to be better accommodated, but we have made no certain provision for a number of these, and later adjustments will need to be made of available space. have made no provision for Treasury needs, but an estimate has been submitted for taking over the Arlington Hotel site and erecting a 10-story building. It came in too late for our consideration, even should the committee desire to consider it.

The estimated cost of the concrete buildings is \$3 a square The salvage when these buildings shall have been removed, as eventually they will be removed, will be practically nothing. In other words, what you get for your machinery, windows, sashes, electric fixtures, and other matters that are the subject of salvage will probably not be more than what it

will cost for the removal of the concrete buildings.

The cost of the wooden buildings will be \$2.25, as best we can figure it. I hope it will be a little under that. As I stated a few moments ago, the Henry Park buildings are going to cost now, with the deficiencies added to them, \$2.16. The salvage on the wooden buildings will probably be about 25 cents, so as to make about \$2 net for the wooden buildings as against \$3 net for the concrete buildings. I think it is important that the committee should keep those figures in mind. The cost is as 2 to 3. Now, these figures were arrived at by consultations with the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds and consultations with the Superintendent of the Capitol, consultations with Gen. Goethals-though I ought to say, in justice to him, that his statement was simply a general statement as to cost without going into the details-and by consultation with the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy, and consultation with one of the officials of the Treasury Department in connection with public buildings. They represent what ought to be the outside cost. The Navy people have actually built concrete buildings at a square-foot cost of \$2.50-I mean, under modern conditions at present prices.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did they do that by advertis-

ing for their materials according to law?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not answer that, as to whether they did it in this instance or not in that way, but they did it for that figure. It is done largely by having the cheapest kind of construction and by having a plan that makes your ground floor practically rest upon the ground, not requiring the support for it that would be required for the other floors. there has to be some stepping, owing to the grade, they estimate that the price would run, at the outside, to \$3.08, and anywhere between \$2.50 and \$3.08 is what is figured would be the cost, dependent upon the character of the ground, the amount of grading that would have to be done, the levels that the buildings were to attain, and matters of that sort. committee took \$3 in order to be safe, and it is proposed that these two concrete buildings shall be built under the direction of the Navy Department. The Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy has probably had more experience in concrete buildings than any people outside of the Army engineers in connection with Panama, and river and harbor work, which is rather different work from this. It is believed that it will take from three to five months as the minimum and maximum to build the wooden buildings, and from four and a half or five months to seven months as minimum and maximum for building the concrete buildings. Of course the amount of building of concrete, if it was increased very much more, might delay quite a bit the finishing of all of the work, because the assembling of the sand and gravel and concrete and the steel for reinforcement, and all of those things, go to delay construction, as you gentlemen appreciate without my stating it.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.
Mr. MEEKER. Is it possible for these concrete buildings to be so constructed that the department can be getting into them before their completion?

Mr. SHERLEY. Partly; but these buildings are going to be three-story buildings only in height. They are made three-story buildings for several reasons, but, among others, to hold down the cost, to prevent the need of elevators, and for quickness of completion. Now, it is possible that part of them may be done, or one building may be done sooner than the other, but I am

giving you the outside figures touching the program.

Now, some of these buildings are being put on the Mall and some of them on the park area. I could stand here and give you 20 good reasons why you ought not to build on either the Mall or the park if I was hunting simply reasons to criticize a building program, and when I got through somebody might ask me what I would do in lieu of that, and I might have some difficulty in answering that. No one wants to see either the Mall or the parks of Washington disfigured. No one desires to do it for the sake of doing it; but no one with appreciation of

the needs of the Nation is going to stop to consider parks in connection with the prosecution of this war. So the committee has no apology to make for proposing to build upon these public areas. The Mall as we have known it is gone forever. I hope that some day will come a bigger and a better one. Some day there may come a scheme whereby we will bring the Mall into the life of the city instead of having it as it is now, and make Pennsylvania Avenue a street to be proud of, a street to rival Princess Street in Edinburgh, with a park on one side and beautiful buildings on the other. But the Mail at present is gone, and the old Mall, spacious in the days of the driving of horses, is to-day so narrow as to be nothing more than a green setting for a few public buildings that are in it; and the great park development of Washington is coming in the Potomac, and the connecting that with Rock Creek, and the driveways that will be measured in many miles instead of in squares.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It occurs to me from the location of the buildings that the gentleman has mentioned that there will be a great congestion. Was that considered by the committee?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will come to that in a moment. It was considered. If there is any difficulty in connection with this matter that we have not considered, we are not conscious of it, because it was a very difficult problem.

Mr. MADDEN. And the gentleman had to consider transpor-

tation facilities in all this?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. Of necessity that also had to be considered. That is one of the determining factors, the proximity to our Government activities, because there is no thing that breeds a waste of time more than scattered activities whereby the man in charge would have to spend half a day in traveling from one place to another. The buildings that will be put at Seventeenth and B Streets will be, by virtue of their bulk, really attractive looking buildings. I think everybody was agreeably surprised at the appearance of those buildings in Henry Park, We had been told that they were going to be so ugly that when they proved not to be that ugly we were rather agreeably surprised.

Now, without adding to the cost there can be made ornamentations of the two faces, that on Seventeenth Street and that on B Street of the first building, and on one face of the second building on B Street, such as will take away from them any ugly appearance. The height is not sufficient to dwarf the Lincoln Memorial, and they do not go far enough back to do it. It took a good deal of nice planning to get buildings of sufficient area and yet so constructed that they would not go back too far toward the Lincoln Memorial or too far to the south to obstruct the vista that should be had of the Lincoln Memorial. The base of the Lincoln Memorial will be almost as high as the roof of these buildings, and in order that we might not again have the unreasoning hysteria touching smokestacks, a hysteria and propaganda of supersensitive art critics of the country which resulted in the inexcusable delay of a power plant that is much needed now, we propose to have the power plant of these buildings next to the brewery on the river, and if it can detract any from the beauty of the brewery we are not aware of the fact.
now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I have always been very much struck with the fact that the most beautiful view back of the White House was toward Arlington, and I want to know whether any of these buildings have been placed so as to interrupt that

Mr. SHERLEY. They have not. One of the proposals that was made was to use the ellipse, that is the loop beyond the rear of the White House. That was rejected. Another proposal was to put the buildings in an L shape around the Monument, occupying some of the space that is now occupied by the swimming pool there. That was thought undesirable, and impracticable except at great expense in the construction because there used to be a great pond there, and it meant a lot of filling, and the spreading of your bases over a very much larger area.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. My recollection is that the Lin-coln Memorial is nearly in line with the portico in the rear of

the White House and Arlington.

Mr. SHERLEY. No.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. With the house at Arlington. Mr. SHERLEY. No; it is not. Here is the White House. Here is the Ellipse. Here is the Washington Monument, and

Arlington is off here [illustrating on map].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. To the left of that? Mr. SHERLEY. Here is the Lincoln Memorial.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. That is more in the direction of Arlington.

Mr. SHERLEY. Here is where these buildings will be put. Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. I think it would interfere with that vista, and I wish the gentleman would look at it

Mr. SHERLEY. I have several times.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. The gentleman does not think that the view from the rear of the White House toward Arling-The gentleman does not think

ton is interrupted by these buildings?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am answering the gentleman that it is not, in my judgment. Existing buildings would interrupt the view if it be as the gentleman thinks. Here is the Pan American Building. This here is a new building, and this is a building under way, and there is another one under way here. Here is another building proposed. All of this area which ought to have been taken last year and on which should have been placed one great series of large buildings of concrete has been taken by various departments on account of the need and covered with wooden buildings. These proposed buildings could not of necessity interfere with the view of Arlington. That would not be interfered with, if it be not interfered with already by the buildings that are there.

Now, some one inquired, and it was a proper inquiry, in connection with transportation facilities. Well, it looks like no matter where we live or work we have to walk if we want to be on time. But assuming that the street car companies will have waked up to their obligations and deal with them adequately, the places selected do not present difficulties as great s would be had if they were put elsewhere. It is proposed now that one of the electric street car lines shall come down-it now comes down Pennsylvania Avenue and on G Street-it is proposed that it shall make a loop in here and strike Virginia Avenue, and then come on back and up again so that all of these buildings would be within two or three squares of that car line. They are now within a few squares of the Pennsylvania Avenue line and have only a couple more squares from the F Street line on Seventeenth and H.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman pardon just

one more question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And then I will subside. Was the housing proposition considered at the time that these buildings were located?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman means the housing of employees?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The housing of employees.
Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; that has been thought about.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Because there are now bills being considered requiring hundreds of millions of dollars for the

housing of employees here and elsewhere.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have thought a great deal about it, and I think the committee has thought about it somewhat. I believe that it is going to be desirable to build on some areas between the Capitol and the Union Station some women's hotels of concrete, which can be built there from plans which I have seen, I believe, at a cost of \$500 a room, and each of these buildings contemplates about 1,500 rooms capacity, with the proper parlor floor, and perhaps a gymnasium or swimming pool included in it.

I think that it is essential that this Government should do something looking particularly to the housing of some of the women employees of the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am glad to get the gentleman's

Mr. SHERLEY. I say "women employees," because the necessity of the situation that confronts them is more difficult than that which confronts men. Men who are worth their salt can usually find somewhere to sleep and take care of themselves, and if all the clerks, both women and men, would consider somewhat living over in the Southeast instead of everybody trying to congest up in the Northwest, they would help to solve a great deal of the problem in connection with the housing of employees. But something ought to be done in regard to the women employees, and I hope there may. We did not go into it to present any real plans to the House at this time. We have presented a plan—
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ken-

tucky has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for 10 minutes more. Is there objection? [After The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHERLEY. We have not undertaken to bring out a plan for the housing of employees.

Now, I think I am warranted in asking this of the House: Even though this building plan does not represent just what the individual Member might have thought desirable, to bear in mind that it is the result of a month of very hard, conscientious work. It represents the judgment of the committee, and when I say the judgment of the committee, I mean that. It represents not simply the judgment of the majority members, but equally of the minority members. It is the most practical thing we could work out.

These buildings ought to be, to the extent that they can be, built of concrete, for two reasons, both of them important. First, the absolute security to life and property; and, second, buildings sufficiently permanent, though not intended to be kept for all time, as will take care for a few years after the war closes of all of the needs of the departments; because we are never going back to the old condition that we knew in Washington. You will never go back to the old size of governmental activities. You will never see the Washington that you knew three or four years ago. There will go up in this city, from selfish interests, a great cry to immediately build great monumental buildings that will take considerable time, and in the meanwhile to tear down anything that they can tear down, in order to continue the very profitable business that was illustrated in a rent account of \$1,700,000 for 3,000,000 square feet of floor space, much of which is not office space at all, but really storage space.

The committee felt that it would be derelict in its duty if it did not present to the House a building program that had enough permanency to give the Government some little leeway and not hold it subject to the greed of men renting space to it. If we have erred, we have erred on the side of conservatism. We would rather not have had to go on the park areas at all. But if you take the areas that are full of buildings now and tear them down, laying aside the cost of acquiring the land, you will postpone by a month, two months, or three months the procurement of these buildings; and time is money now. Therefore the committee presents this in the hope that it may have the approval and indorsement of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning a subject in this bill on which he has not touched. I observe there is a deficiency appropriation for heavy cannon. If I recall correctly, we appropriated last year something like \$2,100,000,000?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is mistaken in his assumption. There is an item of \$676,000 under the head of "Field artillery," which he assumes is for heavy cannon. In point of fact, it is for mortars.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is correct, but it is "For purchase, manufacture, and test of mountain, field, and siege cannon."

Mr. SHERLEY. That is just the generic term. You must permit a little camouflage even in the description of matters of this kind.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he could state approximately the condition of the manufacture of cannon to-day?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I think I could. I would rather not.
Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman would prefer not to

do so?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would prefer not to do so. In the first place, because it is difficult to trust one's memory, and, for a better reason, that I do not think it is desirable to go into the detail of it. I will say this to the gentleman, however, which I think will perhaps answer his question. I do not believe that there will need to be any slowing up of the activities of the war by virtue of an inability to get heavy field artillery. Now, I presume that is what the gentleman wanted to know?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes, incidentally; but it occurred to me, having appropriated \$2,100,000,000, the House ought to have some information, if the gentleman would think proper, as to the state of the development—how many guns are in process of manufacture and when it is expected that they will be delivered.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have within reach a detailed statement not only of that but of nearly every other activity. I do not feel warranted publicly in stating that. I will be glad to give the gentleman such information for his own use as I may have.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That will be perfectly satisfactory.
Mr. MADDEN. Members of the House ought to be able in
some way to get the information.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think that is true, and I think most of the gentlemen can get the information who undertake to get it for their own use. But I am not willing to take the responsibility on this floor of making public details of that kind.

sibility on this floor of making public details of that kind.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not asking the gentleman to do that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know he is not. But I would be glad to give the gentleman personally any information I can at any time.

Mr. MADDEN. I will be delighted to have it. While I want to do everything I can to promote the success of the war, at the

same time I want to have some intelligent conception of why I am doing it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I will answer the gentleman as to that phase of it now. He is not being asked to spend any money in connection with field artillery proper, and therefore a knowledge of that schedule is not necessary for a determination of his duty on this bill.

I thank the gentlemen of the committee for their generous consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the subcommittee that framed this bill, but in the absence of some of the other members I did sit more or less with the committee, and the chairman very courteously consulted me about some of the items. I agree with my distinguished friend who preceded me in the opinion that it is a well-digested bill. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Sherley] in his very elaborate and thorough speech voiced my sentiments, and I am in full accord with him. Although its size shocked us, or would have shocked us six months ago, yet we are getting accustomed to it, and it is a bill which I think we must all unite in supporting and passing. Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Speaking of the size of the bill, I read an interesting statement this morning concerning the cost of various wars. This bill is almost identically the amount of the cost of the war between Great Britain and South Africa, which lasted for two years.

Mr. GILLETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I take advantage of the liberty of general debate for a few minutes to call attention to an incident which happened last week on one of the very few days when I was not present. It was an extension of remarks by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris]. I am sorry to see that he is not present at this time, but I notified him this afternoon that I should make some comments upon it, and he has had every opportunity to be here.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris] asked unant-mous consent to extend his remarks, and under that unanimous consent he published what I presume some of you have read, an editorial which was a glorification of the Democratic Party and denunciation of the Republican Party. The whole tenor and purpose of the editorial was to convey the impression that the recent investigations and disclosures and the criticisms of the War Department were a part of a Republican campaign preparatory to the next election.

Now I think that was a most unfair and improper use of the privileges of extension, because I think you gentlemen on that side will admit that during the whole of the last session, and during this session, we on this side of the House have studiously abstained from any action or from any debate which could be construed as criticism of the administration. I know for myself that has been the rule of action, and, as far as I know, on this side of the House it has also been the invariable rule of action.

I do not think that the gentleman from Oklahoma, or any other gentleman on that side of the House, would have spoken the words which are here inserted in the Record in that editorial; they would have been ashamed to. There is nothing at all improper in it as an editorial. It is one of that kind of partisan outbursts which all party organs indulge in at election time and which undoubtedly most of us in elections and on the stump indulge in—abuse of the other party and glorifying our own party, although perhaps this distorts the truth more than usual. But at this time and under these circumstances I think it was very unfair for the gentleman from Oklahoma to put it in the Record.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. And it is particularly unfair in view of the

fact that it gives it the franking privilege.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, yes, I presume the reason the gentleman put it in the Record was that probably out in the wilds of Oklahoma there was some disturbance and worry about the criticisms of the administration which were being made, and the gentleman thought that by having something which he could frank and which would stir up partisan bitterness amongst his political supporters there he would divert their attention from the real facts and make them think this was a Republican political scheme. Whereas I am sure you gentlemen know that in this House nothing has happened upon which to base such a charge.

Mr. SLOAN. In the request for leave to extend, does the gentleman advise the House of the nature of the proposed extension?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I think the gentleman's manner of securing his leave to print was as objectionable as what he printsd.

A few days before he obtained his leave he rose in the House and made this request:

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the

RECORD.

The Speaker. Is there objection?

Mr. Walsh. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what sub-

ject?
Mr. FERRIS. I want to print a short editorial on the war, peace, and

Mr. Chairman, that "short" editorial, as he describes it, occupies over two of the wide columns of the Congressional RECORD in small print! He calls that a short editorial, and I venture to say that 90 per cent of the editorials which are published in the country are far shorter than that. He obviously wished to minimize it. Then he speaks of its subject as "Peace and against war.' I do not like to use the language which naturally comes to my mind in describing that statement, but I shall leave it to the House to read that editorial and see whether "Peace and against war" fairly describes it any more than the expression "short" describes the length of the editorial.

Mr. ROBBINS. On what day was that printed? Mr. LONGWORTH. Monday, February 4, and is on page

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman if this editorial which appears in the Record appears as a result

of that request?

Mr. GILLETT. No; he did not print it then, because the gentleman objected; but a few days after that, at the end of the session, when as you know very few Members are here, after there had been a debate in which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris] had taken part, at the end of the session the gentleman from Oklahoma again rose and again requested to extend his remarks in the RECORD. a different day, a few days later. Of course, the membership of the House presumes, as we know is always presumed, that when a man who has just made remarks rises and asks permission to extend that it is for the purpose of extending those particular remarks, and I have no doubt that when the gentleman rose and asked to extend his remarks in the Record everybody assumed that, and it may possibly have occurred to the gentleman himself that they would assume that. Nobody then objected, and the gentleman then printed this "short" editorial on "Peace and against war." As I say, I think the manner in which the gentleman inserted the matter in the Record is as objectionable as the matter itself.

Generally Members of the House trust each other, and as a rule the Members of the House do not take advantage of each other, but we all know that there are occasionally men who have to be watched. I never supposed the gentleman from Oklahoma, for whom I always have had great regard and respect, was in that class, and I am sorry and disappointed to find both what he has done and the manner in which he did it.

The minority has carefully ascertained from such partisan debate as is illustrated by this editorial, and we have in a measure departed from what is ordinarily the province of a minority. The normal province of a minority is to criticize. It is always good for the Government that there should be an alert, active minority, ready to criticize and watch what is being done by the majority. It conduces to good administration. But under the extraordinary circumstances of this session the minority was faced by two alternatives. Should we follow the ordinary course of a minority, should we criticize and oppose the majority and the administration, or under the very peculiar circumstances which now exist, appreciating that the prosecution of this war was the one thing that both majority and minority were bent upon, should we ignore the ordinary practice of the minority, although we did see frequent acts of the administration which we did not approve—should we openly criti-cize them or remain silent? I have thought it my duty under the present circumstances to depart from and abandon the or-dinary conduct of a minority, and instead of criticizing lend my best efforts to the support and assistance not only to the majority of this House but to the administration, to hold up its hands, and to increase its strength and popularity as far as I

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. In substantiation of the gentleman's argument, may I call his attention to the fact that on the conscription measure, which was more necessary than any other in the proper prosecution of this war, the draft law, the support the President received on this side of the House as compared with the support he received on the Democratic side was in the ratio of 3 to

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I have avoided even pointing out such facts as that here. I do not wish to raise any question

of partisanship, and I have not. I think on the Democratic side of the House, as well as on ours, there has been no attempt to criticize us or excite our partisanship. We all know that these investigations which have been made, the investigations of the War Department and the disclosures and the criticism which followed, were not made by a partisan Republican committee, but were made by Democratic committees. closures were brought forward by Democratic committees, and the criticisms have been made more by Democratic Members of Congress than by Republican Members of Congress. Therefore for the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Ferris] to inject into this House a charge of that kind is I think entirely uncalled for and is worthy of criticism. Of course the results of these investigations are still pending. Just what a Member of the minority ought to do under the circumstances doubtless we have all of us found difficult to decide. I get letters from my constituents, as I presume you all do, of two different tenors. Some letters are complaining of existing conditions, are complaining of the great powers of the administration and its abuses, and are demanding criticisms and change. On the other hand, I have some letters urging me to continue to support the administration, and I had one yesterday which went so far as to ask me to support the administration and to support every recommendation, general and specific, which the President should make.

If we are to do that, we might just as well resign. That, of course, means that we are never to express our own opinions but we are always to express the opinions which come to us from the White House. I do not suppose any Member on either side of the Chamber would pretend that was a proper attitude for us to take. Now, for myself, I have the greatest admira-tion for the occupant of the White House. I think in one respect his conduct has been absolutely above all criticism, and our Nation is to be congratulated that he is there and that he is our spokesman in the state papers which he has issued. [Applause.] It seems to me that as the man who is voicing the opinion of the United States, the man who is the spokesman for the whole people and who is placing our case before the world, he has been as nigh perfect as could be hoped from humanity. [Applause.] In that I yield him honor and praise and unstinted admiration. In the past his wonderful facility in epigrams has sometimes led him to make those which were unfortunate, but since this war began he has been a superb spokesman for the whole American people. But although we admire him in that capacity, I do not suppose it follows that we, as Members of a coordinate branch of the Republic, are bound to think that he is perfect in every other act that he performs. I do not believe it necessarily follows that his selection of agents, his judgment of men, is perfect. I do not believe it follows that his administrative ability is perfect or that his judgment of organization is always beyond criticism. seems to me in those matters we must follow our own judgment and perform the duty which has been imposed upon us by our Now, these investigations which have been constituents. made-not by Republicans, but which have been made by Democratic committees—these investigations have borne fruit. they were made there was no suggestion in the War Department, for instance, that there should be any changes at all; but, following these investigations, changes of organization have already been inaugurated in the War Department, and whether they may effect good, I am very sure they can not do harm and make it any worse. Of course no mere organization of itself would insure good results. Any personnel can spoil any organization. You must have an efficient man for chief responsibility in order to make any organization effective. But at the same time a good organization with the same personnel will achieve vastly better results than a poor organization. And these investigations have apparently produced changes of organization which I believe the better, and indeed the President apparently up to the time of these investigations did not believe that any reorganization of the department was necessary, although such reorganization was urged and agitated in Congress.

These disclosures were made upon the very heels of these investigations, and now the President comes to Congress and asks it for absolute power to make a reorganization of his department. He does not say to Congress, "You were intrusted by the Constitution with the power of organization of departments, and I would be glad to have you reorganize them." He does not even suggest to Congress what reorganiza-tion he would like, what reorganization Congress under its constitutional powers should effect; he simply asks us to abandon all our constitutional rights and to pass them over to the President and allow him to make any reorganization he desires. That may be the wisest plan, but I think any Congress would be somewhat slow in adopting such a plan as that. Now, there

is another instance where it seems to me

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman recalls that we gave a former President power in a similar way to reorganize the customs service as being about the only practical way by which that service could be reorganized. We permitted the President to reorganize and redistrict the country for customs purposes and abolish quite a number of customs offices, Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. That is upon the theory that if we by legislative act should try to abolish any customs office we would get into a great many difficulties that could not be solved in a legislative way. Does not the same principle apply to reorganizations of other departments—that it could be better carried out on a general comprehensive plan than by piecemeal work by Congress?

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman think the best way to reorganize the departments is to give the President the power

to reorganize as he pleases.

Mr. BORLAND. I certainly do. Mr. GILLETT. Well, that is where-

Mr. BORLAND. There exists overlapping authority, and the President, as head of the executive department of the Government, can curtail a great deal of that overlapping authority and produce a great deal better results than—

Mr. GILLETT. He can under the present law.
Mr. BORLAND, I am not so sure.
Mr. GILLETT, That is placed the

That is where the gentleman is mistaken, Mr. GILLETT. because, if he will look at the law, he will see that under the recommendation of the Bureau of Efficiency-if that is the right title-the President can already make very extensive reorganizations. And, if the gentleman will recall, the reason we intrusted the reorganization of the customs service to the President was not because the Executive was especially qualified to do it, but because of the fact that it affected interests in this House; because that was a matter which spread all over the country, and combinations were made in the House to prevent such reorganization

Mr. BORLAND. Did not we realize that it was practically impossible to abolish a single customhouse by action of this

House?

Mr. GILLETT. Not a single customhouse, but many.
Mr. BORLAND. And therefore it was necessary to have the

President deal with the entire proposition.

Mr. GILLETT. But that has no application, for instance, to such a thing as a department of munitions—no application at all.

Now, another matter which has been suggested to the House by the President, on which it seems to me Members of Congress ought at least to hesitate before following such a suggestion as my correspondent made, is the recent bill which was introduced by the leader of the majority and referred to the Ways and Means Committee, in which one man, the Secretary of the Treasury, is given power over a fund of \$500,000,000, with authority to issue notes for \$4,000,000,000, by which he shall practically finance this war, and which gives him power to practically close any large industry in the country.

Now, that may be wise; but what impressed me in that bill, wondered at the assurance of the administration in asking that the Secretary of the Treasury, subject to the approval of the President, should have the power to appoint a board of directors, not to be confirmed by the Senate, but to be appointed by himself, the salary to be fixed by himself up to an amount not exceeding \$12,000, and then this board appointed by himself and with the salary fixed by himself could at any time be dismissed by him. He appoints them, he has the power of dismissal, and he has the power of fixing their salary. yet that great organization, which would be but a puppet of the Secretary of the Treasury, will have the whole business of the country in its grasp. When an administration comes before Congress and asks such authority it seems to me that Members of Congress on both sides of the House might well consider carefully the merits of the question and whether or not authority of that kind should be granted.

Mr. ROBBINS. Who prepared such a bill as that? Mr. GILLETT. It is prepared by the adminis

Mr. GILLETT. It is prepared by the administration. I can not telt who, but it is sponsored before the committee by the Secretary of the Treasury, its chief beneficiary. All I know is that it is presented as an administration bill, giving the Secretary of the Treasury, who I do not think has the entire confidence of the business world, these unbeard of powers.

Now, we on this side have not been backward in giving the President authority. We ought not to be. I recognize that in a time of war the President ought to have very large powers. We certainly have given generously to the administration since this war began powers far beyond what any President of the

United States ever exercised. And I for one expect to continue to grant powers which I deem necessary-not everything, it seems to me, that an administration may ask-but I expect to continue in the future, as I have in the past, to join with that side of the House and loyally grant every dollar which we think he can wisely spend, and to give all the powers which we think are necessary for the prosecution of the war, and to suppress all partisan feeling as far as possible.

But if we granted everything the administration asked this very appropriation bill before us would be \$500,000,000 bigger The Committee on Appropriations has cut out of it \$500,000,000 which was asked, not because we did not wish to grant the administration everything which we thought they could possibly use, and not from any criticism of the departments in their estimates, but because errors were found-places were found where large amounts could be cut down without any injury to the Government. And therefore, as I say, by refusing to simply blindly grant the requests of the administra-tion we have cut out of this bill \$500,000,000. And last summer we cut out-I do not remember how much, but I venture to say \$1,500,000,000 from the requests that were then made. do not mean, of course, that that is all saved. Very much of it is postponed, very much of it is uncertain; but, at any rate, for the time being it makes the expenses so definite that you can compare them with the receipts and be able to calculate upon the necessary revenues

Mr. TOWNER: Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GHLLETT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. In these eliminations which have been made. cutting out the \$500,000,000 from the estimates of the depastments, the committee unanimously, without any division, recommends the elimination?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly. Mr. TOWNER. So that the So that the eliminations have the approval of both sides of the House?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly. There never has been since the beginning of this war any partisan division. I think always the Appropriations Committee has been less subject to partisanship than any other committee. But there never has been since the beginning of this war, to my knowledge, the slightest partisan division in the membership of that committee. I am happy to say that the majority of it treat the minority with just as much consideration as if they belonged to their own party, and I think we have tried to cooperate with them, and we have given the administration every dollar which we thought it could wisely expend.

I noticed in the paper last night, in large headlines, that the President had ordered an investigation of the Hog Island yard. Why, my friends, that shows again that Congress ought not entirely to sit here as a rubber stamp for the administration and that the action of our committees is useful, because some weeks ago in this House the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, by unanimous vote I believe, and certainly by no partisan vote, went to the Committee on Rules and asked them to give a rule for the investigation of conditions at Hog

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I know the gentleman desires to be accurate.

Mr. GILLETT. I certainly do. Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The request as it came to the Committee on Rules was not a request for the investigation, It was a request that the Committee on Rules consider * resolu-Subsequently the author of the resolution came before the Committee on Rules and withdrew the request.

Mr. GILLETT. Yes. And I can tell the gentleman, and he probably knows, why he withdrew it. I see no difference in the gentleman's statement and mine, for the gentleman, I am sure, will admit the purpose was for a rule allowing the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to investigate. The reason why that request was withdrawn was that a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries had a consultation with the chairman of the Shipping Board and told bing the facts which that committee wished to investigate and the scandals which they thought existed, and the chairman of the Shipping Board asked that he be allowed to make the investigation himself first. And on that assurance the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries did not press their request. But they took the initiative. They had made the request and the chairman of the Shipping Board undertook to make an investigation, and therefore they withdrew their request for an investigation. That was several weeks ago, I think, and now last night the paper said, as if it was a new

thing, "The President has ordered an investigation of the Hog Island scandal.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman, if he will permit, that I do not know anything about the conference between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. En-MONDS] and the head of the Shipping Board, Mr. Hurley; but Mr. Hurley appeared before the Committee on Rules and stated that he could see no objection whatever to the investigation; that the investigation which had been carried on by the Senate

had been very helpful to the board and he did not oppose in any way action by the Committee on Rules. Nor did the Committee on Rules at any time oppose any investigation. There never was any feeling about the matter.

Mr. GILLETT. Exactly. I did not mean to intimate that there was. It was amicably agreed that the chairman of the Shipping Board should make an investigation. I simply use this as an illustration here. So there was something useful that the action of a committee of Congress effected, and that is the attitude which I have assumed on these investigations.

The comments on these investigations are what I object to in that article. These investigations that have caused so much disturbance throughout the country did not originate in partisan feeling. They originated in Democratic committees. Of course, it is always a question to be considered in a war whether you are going to do more good by making an investigation and bringing out disclosures and thereby disquieting the people than by not making the investigation; whether you will do more good and at the same time obtain better results, and whether the obtaining of better results is going to be more important than to excite distress and disquiet among the people. I have felt that it was not for us in the minority to take that responsibility. But I do believe myself that the result of these investigations, judging from the changes that apparently are contemplated by the administration in the War Department, has been helpful.

But I have wandered far afield from what I intended, and that brings me back to my text, this insertion in the Record by a gentleman on that side of the House of charges that I do not believe any man on that side of the House would have wanted to stand up in his seat and make himself, and I think it is unworthy of the gentleman and unwise and objectionable,

and I hope it will not be repeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GARNER). The time of the gentleman

from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that he did not happen to be in the Chair when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon] was through, but he is informed that the gentleman from Illinois yielded to the gentleman from Massachusetts such time as he might desire.

Mr. GILLETT. He did. The CHAIRMAN. That was 20 minutes. The Chair per-

mitted the gentleman from Massachusetts to run over that time. Mr. GILLETT. When the Chair said my time had expired I asked to be recognized in my own right, and I thought that after that I was talking in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to yield some of his time?

Mr. GILLETT. I desire to yield to the gentleman from Wyo-

The CHAIRMAN. How much time?
Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, how is the time divided in this debate? Is there any limit on it?
The CHAIRMAN. No; only the general rule.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Sherley] consumed two hours and a quarter. I understood the gentleman from Kentucky to say that he hoped to read the bill to night.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think we can read the bill for an hour

to-night

Mr. GILLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is 45 minutes. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, on a previous occasion, when we were considering an appropriation bill, I stated, speaking

for myself, but I think expressing the views of the members of the committee, that I could not say even in regard to a bill relative to the details of which I might be much more familiar than I am with this bill, that all of the sums proposed to be appropriated were necessary or essential.

The duty of the committee is to scrutinize with care the estimates submitted, and in time of peace the duty of the committee is to guard with very jealous care the Federal Treasury, and to resolve any doubts that they may have in their minds in favor of the Treasury rather than in favor of the estimates.

But in time of war the committee is compelled to adopt a different attitude toward estimates. Its first duty is to see that no sums asked for and necessary, or likely to be necessary, for the prosecution of the war are withheld, and in case of doubt it is the duty of the committee to resolve the doubt in favor of the Government, in favor of the estimates and the opinions of the men who present them.

That is what the committee has done in this bill, as in the case of all other bills that have come before the committee since the war began. It is true there has been a reduction in many of the estimates, more apparent than real in some cases, all of which illustrates how much more careful and thorough and painstaking committees of Congress sometimes are than the gentlemen who prepare estimates, because I believe that the men who appeared before the committee in support of the estimates will admit that after the matter had all been thrashed out and the committee had reached a decision the committee had made a better guess as to the amounts they would be likely to need, even from the standpoint of abundance, than they themselves had made in the original estimates.

Not a necessary dollar has been withheld. Of that I am assured by the gentlemen on the subcommittee who are much more familiar with the items than I can be, and I feel confident of that from what knowledge I have personally of the items in

The Republican Party, whatever else may be said about it, whatever sins of omission or commission it may have been guilty of as an organization, has beyond all question and controversy been ever and always a party of patriotism. [Applause.] has never been any question about that in the mind of any honest, unbiased, and unprejudiced well-informed person. Republican Party during this war is simply marching true to form [applause]; simply pursuing its historic policy; simply maintaining its unvarying and unvaried attitude of patriotism and support of the Government and administration. [Applause.]

Now, the gentlemen on the other side are doing likewise. But it makes a good deal of difference, when you come to all of these matters of legislation and appropriation, whether those who are suggesting and asking for and are to administer and use them are of your own political household of faith or whether they are of another political household. No matter how good a patriot a man may be, if he is a good citizen and worth his salt he is also a partisan, using the term in its proper and best sense, and there is always an inclination to follow your own administration wherever it may lead and whither it may wander, no matter how far afield. There is likewise always a temptation to criticize the opposition, and it is a temptation that within proper lines and limitations should be yielded to, so far as opposition and criticism may be helpful and useful in the establishment of proper policies in the wise development of administrative measures and the economical expenditure of the public money.

As the Republican Party began, so it will continue, so far as this war is concerned and all other wars in which we may ever be involved. It may make other mistakes in other times, but if it remains true to the principles on which it was founded, and which have ever actuated the overwhelming majority of its membership, it will always be found supporting the Government, holding up the arm of those in authority, maintaining the dignity of the Nation, and standing for the honor of the flag. These are somewhat trying times for a patriot, particularly one not of the administration party, but also, I may say in passing, at times for those of the administration party; for revolution succeeds revolution, either in proposal or performance, more rapidly under this flag and in these days than anywhere under popular government. Starting out at the beginning of the war with a Constitution that limited and restricted the powers and prerogatives of Congress, we have been compelled to take a view of the great palladium of our liberties that justified us in granting extraordinary powers to those in control. No sooner do we make one extraordinary grant of power, which seems the very apex and pinnacle, than we are asked to grant other powers that loom so mountain high that the first enactment is as a molehill in comparison. We are asked now, or will be shortly, not only to grant autocratic powers to the President beyond those legally held by any prince or potentate under the sunwe have already done that-but we will be asked to grant powers to reorganize the governmental structure in a way that would leave the President the most unlimited autocrat that the world has seen in many a long day. It may be that a part of these things ought to be done. I am not at this time expressing an opinion.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. MONDELL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee. Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman desire that last statement to stand fully-to reorganize the entire structure

of the Government?

Mr. MONDELL. The administrative structure, perhaps I should have said.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Executive. Mr. MONDELL. Not the judicial structure.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Nor the legislative.
Mr. MONDELL. Well, the legislative structure seems for the time being-and I am not saying that in a criticizing wayto exist only for the purpose of placing autocratic power in the Executive. There is no necessity for changing the legislative structure, so long as the legislative machinery works along the lines of the Executive will in all of these propositions intended to promote executive and administrative power. I thank the gentleman for correcting me, or giving me an opportunity to make a little more clear what I had in mind. And I will say to the gentleman that I am not making any promises or predictions on my own behalf as to what my attitude with regard to those propositions should be. I am simply referring to their very extraordinary character, a character that a short time ago would have shocked us all, but we are getting gradually accustomed to proposals that in other times would have been calculated, as we then viewed the matter, to make the Goddess of Liberty up yonder on the Dome of the Capitol totter on her lofty pedestal. I hope the lady is herself becoming accustomed to these changes, even as we are, because I would not want to have the Dome endangered, or that splendid emblem of liberty unsteady on its foundations

Mr. SHERLEY. She is used to exalted attitudes.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the gentleman will permit, is it not a fact that the Republican Party always having stood for and believed in a strong, centralized government, the members of that party received a less shock from some of these proposed reforms than our Democratic brethren, who have always taken the opposite view?

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman is right about that to a certain extent, though we have not stood for an autocratic

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the gentleman's remark, being translated, mean that he is willing to do that in time of peace, when

there is no excuse for it?

Mr. MONDELL. That is not so much a matter of party as it is of personal temperament. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Sherley], without intending to do it, has cast something of a reflection on these revolutionary performances. Having so far considered, and, finally, with some reluctance, approved and embraced them as necessary in war, I would not venture now to criticize them.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Are the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Iowa, and myself correct in drawing this conclusion from the profound and philosophic discussion of the gentleman from Wyoming, that there is any general or comprehensive surrender of the Executive jurisdiction of this country?

Mr. MONDELL. I have heard some suggestions that were a little startling, but I think that is the most startling of them all. Has there been any surrender of Executive jurisdiction? Well,

not that anybody has heard of.

Mr. MADDEN. Was that a question or a comment?

Mr. MONDELL. A question in the form of a comment, and the questioner knew the answer. Certainly there has been no surrender of Executive jurisdiction, and more power is asked for, and, within certain limits, perhaps it should be granted.

Mr. TOWNER. The inquiry was suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Garrert] as to whether or not the bill to which the gentleman refers was any interference with the powers of the legislative department. I want to call attention, just by way of illustration-

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman permit?
Mr. TOWNER. Did I misunderstand the gentleman from

Tennessee?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I did not say anything about the bill. I referred to the statement of the gentleman from

Wyoming.

Mr. TOWNER. I accept the amendment. Just by way of illustration I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the bill which we have under consideration makes an appropriation for transportation of the Army of \$125,000,000. Is it not true that if the powers are granted to the President which he desires, he might transfer that appropriation of \$125,000,000 from the transportation of troops to, for instance, the Indian Service or any other service that he desired?

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is undoubtedly true.
Mr. TOWNER. And that would be an entire abrogration to

the Executive of appropriations which are specific?

Mr. MONDELL. Assuming that the new organization, or

think it logically would, lump-sum appropriations, that is entirely true. In other words, we could not well appropriate for several branches of the public service under certain heads, and under certain jurisdictions and control, if we had a provision of law whereby all present organizations might be wiped out and those distinctions cease.

Mr. TOWNER. But I will say to the gentleman that that is not left only to inference, because, as I understand the bill, and as it has been published and proposed, it allows the President to transfer these funds by an Executive order, if he so

desires.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Only for the purposes for which

they are appropriated. I think.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, while it is true that we, as a party, and gentlemen on both sides, have given the Government all the funds and all the authority and all the man power necessary for the conduct of the war, and shall continue to do so, it is also true that within certain lines, intended to be helpful and con-structive, we can not, even while the war is in progress, entirely absolve ourselves from the duty of reasonable criticism. That should be limited to those things which will, as the gentleman from Illinois so well stated a moment ago, be helpful and useful in bringing about reforms.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I ask the gentleman if another bill recently introduced in Congress, to form a war corporation with \$500,000.000 capital, to be administered by one man, has had the

benefit of the gentleman's perusal?

Mr. MONDELL. I must say that I am reserving the shock which I expect to receive when I carefully peruse that bill to a

later day.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think the gentleman, in referring to the bill introduced into another body as being a very great grant of power and authority, will find when he examines this bill more carefully that it confers, on another gentleman it is true, but a member of the family, a far greater power than that which

shocked his judgment.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is probably true, because when in a great industrial country you give control over practically all the industries of the country, you not only grant a most extraordinary power, affecting every individual in the country in his business and in his opportunity to gain a livelihood, but, in addition to that, you place in the hands of the officer who is granted that power, a political power so great that it is altogether possible that it might be so used as to perpetuate a man or party indefinitely. I think that is one of the things that should be very carefully considered, because I hope gentlemen on the Democratic side are no more disposed than gentlemen on the Republican side to create conditions in this country under which men will be greatly tempted to use extraordinary power and authority for the purpose of perpetuating their control. hope we are all of us willing to take our political chances, and we all realize that it is better for our country that no party shall be so fortified and intrenched that the siege guns and the mortars of an outraged citizenship can not dislodge it from its trench lines and its citadel. [Applause.]

But I am not going to criticize unless I think it will be helpful to better conditions. It requires considerable restraint to withhold criticism when in times like these there is so much that is subject to criticism, but I propose to do it as far as possible and never indulge in criticism except as I hope it may be

helpful.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield before he goes to another topic?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. What does the gentleman think of the practice of a government—I am not speaking of this Government now—in trying to build up public opinion through organs created and managed by itself, as the German Government has done by its control of the press and its publication of articles which originate entirely with the Government, and of course which finds everything the Government does highly sat-

isfactory and worthy of the highest merit?

I think there will be no disagreement on Mr. MONDELL. the proposition that there is very great danger in a press official or otherwise controlled politically by a government by an administration. There is an appropriation bill which we passed regularly through this House that for years has carried legislation which I had some part in framing intending to restrain and control the effort to build up public sentiment favorable to a certain kind of administration. That was in time of peace. We are in war now, and, while I personally think we may be overdoing the matter of official publicity, I think some of it has been helpful and useful in certain lines, and I am not disposed to criticize it, although I do feel that it has gone far afield. Of course, when I say this I do not intend to include the three reorganization, or consolidation sought would involve, as I publicity agents at Hog Island, one drawing a salary of \$10,000, one at \$7,500, and one \$6,000 a year, whose duty it was to camouflage the situation and cover with an ambuscade of rhetoric and misinformation the patriotic gentlemen who were drawing seven salaries in the alleged behalf of the launching of a merchant marine.

Mr. SLOAN. If the gentleman will yield, I am somewhat concerned about the question submitted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Green], and I would like to know if he can give the relevancy of that question. I did not understand that there were any publications of that kind in America, and if there are not why take up European government practices as if there were such here in America?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, whatever the facts are let us, for the sake of the argument, assume there are not. [Laughter.]

But there are some things that ought to come out, there are some things that have come out, in regard to some of our cantonments, and shipbuilding, and all that sort of thing, and it is proper they should come out, and they have come out largely through the efforts of Democrats. They have come out in a way I hope may be helpful. You can not properly charge the man at the head of affairs with responsibility for these things. Some of them are perhaps inevitable in times of enormous expansion. The thing to do, when we find them, is to punish the men who are guilty in order that they shall no longer cast discredit on men in authority and bring dishonor to their Govern-

There was a cloth-sorting contract made here some time ago. A certain gentleman named Eisenman, of the Council of Na-tional Defense, had something to do with it. A gentleman Pereless, who, it seems, is an organization expert from New York, was invited down here and put in charge of a bureau or division for the reclamation of waste materials. He was given a captain's commission. In due course of time it became his duty to examine into this sorting contract, this contract under which certain gentlemen were to take old uniforms, I believe, and make them over or utilize them as best they could. I know little about the contract. In the course of his service Capt. Pereless made an investigation into this contract. was called to testify in regard to it before a Senate committee. It is claimed by those who pretend to know that the Government has saved a great deal of money, several millions, by reason of the contract having been annulled or modified. Capt. Pereless was a captain, but he is a captain no longer. He was honorably discharged, it is true, as a man who had so well served his Government should be, but the captain did not want to be separated from the public service. He desired to serve,

He had asked to be put on the inactive list in order that he might secure service somewhere else under the Government, because I assume his service in the particular pureau to which he had been assigned was not altogether pleasant after he had made the investigations and revelations referred to. Instead of a transfer he got a discharge. I commend that particular case to the gentlemen who are responsible under the administration and for the honest conduct of affairs. It may have been entirely proper, but it would be a very unhappy thing at this time of crisis, when we need all of the honest men and all of the careful, painstaking men, and all of the fearless investigators we can get to guard the Government against waste and looting and fraud-it would be most unfortunate in this juncture if it should become known or believed that when men do what they believe to be their duty they soon find themselves separated from the public service and returned to private life. It would be a very sad and unfortunate thing for the country if we should arrive at that condition of affairs, and I hope that some one will investigate that discharged, which is referred to on the first page of one of the morning papers of this city.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I suggest to the gentleman that he read into his speech the examination in that case?

Mr. MONDELL. I will be glad to do so, if the House will give me that privilege. The portion of the article in the Washington Post of this morning relating to Capt. Pereless's examination is as follows:

SAVED UNITED STATES ABOUT \$2,000,000.

On December 29 he was summoned as a witness before the Senate Military Committee, and described at length the investigation into the sorting plant, the cancellation of which saved the Government about \$2,000,000. The following is the verbatim report of a portion of the testimony, taken from the official committee report:

"Senator McKellar. In your dealings with Mr. Eisenman, was he much interested in this control, retaining this control, through the Base Sorting Plant?

Sorting Plant?

Capt. Pereless. Well, he was very anxious not to have the contract

Senator McKellar. What did he say about it? RECALLS EISENMAN'S WORDS.

"Capt. Perriess. I only spoke to him once, when I delivered a letter to him in which the Quartermaster General advised him the contract would be annulled, and he seemed to think it would be a very great mis-

take and a bad thing for the Government; that the Government could not carry on that sorting themselves. He asked me who I reported to and where I got my orders, and he said he would show me where I got my orders.

"Senator McKellar. That he would show you where you got your

"Capt. Pereless. Yes, sir.

"Senator McKellar. In other words, he felt offended that you should have brought in any such notice.

"Capt. Pereless. He probably did not feel I had any authority for doing it, although I had the letter signed by Gen. Sharpe.

"Senator McKellar. And he threatened you for your action in the matter?"

After this, in January, Capt. Pereless presented a plan for the reorganization of the conservation division, which was not acted upon. Two other men were placed in charge of the reorganization, and Capt. Pereless, who found himself deprived of the opportunity to do the work for which, as an expert, he had been requested to come to Washington, asked to be returned to the inactive list of the Officers' Reserve Corps, with the intention of being assigned to duty in another branch of the service.

Instead, Capt. Pereless received orders giving him an honorable discharge from the Army and dismissing him from the service.

He protested against this discharge, stating that he desired active duty elsewhere. That request was denied.

Naturally the incident has aroused much interest in the Army in view of the testimony of Capt. Pereless before a committee of the United States Senate, where he was summoned to inform Senators of conditions within the department with which he has had to do.

Mr. Chairman, so much for my preface now. I want to discuss an item in the bill, and I may ask the gentleman in charge

of the time for a few minutes more in which to discuss it. Mr. MADDEN. I would like to read the real story if this is

but the preface.

Mr. MONDELL. A provision was inserted in the nationaldefense act which became a law the 17th of last August for a revolving fund of two and a half million dollars, which was to be used for the purpose of purchasing, sorting, storing, and selling seeds for cash. Under that appropriation a large amount of seed corn was secured and a considerable amount of wheat, barley, rye, some cotton, and other seed, and is being distributed and sold. The Department of Agriculture has asked for an additional sum of \$6,000.000 for the same purpose. The committee has reported \$4,000,000 for that purpose. At the proper time I shall ask to increase that amount to \$6,000,000, the amount of the estimate, and shall seek to modify the language somewhat by providing that these seeds in addition to being sold at cost for cash may also be sold on credit not to exceed one year with approved security of local business organizations. I think there is no item in this bill more important in its way than that. Of course, when you are at war the most important items are for guns and powder and uniforms, but at the same time we must sustain the men in the field and we must sustain the populations at home, and we need to encourage agriculture. The item in question has served a useful purpose. It has enabled the department to purchase the seeds and the department is now selling them and will continue to do so. It has obligated the Government in practically the full sum—two and a half million dollars-but can use considerably more.

But so far as a considerable part of the country is concerned, this fund is not available in a satisfactory way so long as the sales must be for cash. There has been a good deal of agitation at one time or another, there always is from time to time when we have droughts, freshets, and that sort of thing, for the free distribution of Government seed. I am one of those who believe we ought to be very careful about making free distributions. They are not very likely to be equitably or wisely distributed. It is not a good thing to get the people to thinking that Uncle Sam is a liberal, not to say spendthrift, father, who can pick dollars off of bushes along the road and hand them out wherever they think they need them. The people of the country, the farmers of the country, hard up as some of them are, are not I think they want to pay for what they receive. But let me illustrate the condition in a territory some three or four hundred miles wide and stretching from the Canadian border to the Gulf, including the States from Texas north to North Dakota, parts of some eight or nine States. Over a considerable portion of most of those States we have had a condition of drought, very severe in Texas, equally so in some parts of Montana, less severe and less trying in other sections in between. In my own State of Wyoming for a number of years past we have had in several counties local organizations of bankers, merchants, and stockmen who have obligated themselves for a sufficient sum of money to furnish seeds to those who needed them and were unable to purchase and pay cash for them. These local organizations have sold these seeds at cost. They have loaned the money without interest or with a very small interest charge, and in most cases, I believe, they have been successful in securing the return of the loan, all or a very great portion of it.

But there is a condition up there now under which it is more difficult than it ever has been in the past for these local organizations to handle the situation. There are many reasons for that, which I have not the time to discuss, but that such is the fact is known to all of the people of that section. My thought is this: That if we could provide that this fund, or seeds purchased with it, might be loaned on approved security given by business organizations, we could very quickly secure those organizations and thus furnish seeds for which those organizations should become responsible. We might thus very promptly distribute among the farmers of such sections the rye, wheat, sugar-beet seed, potatoes, corn, kaffir corn, millet, and cotton, which they must have if we are to have the maximum production of that great western country. My thought is that the Secretary of Agriculture might call upon such local organizations to inform him as to the amount of money needed in their counties, for instance, assuming the county as the unit of organization for the purpose of securing seed. Local organizations in my State know what is needed, because they have been in the business in the past. The question would be asked of such local organizations, To what extent will you guarantee the Government the return of the funds—\$5,000, \$10,000, \$15,000, or \$20,000—covering the cost of seed needed in that locality by those unable to pay cash? These local organizations could very quickly place before the Secretary statements showing their financial responsibility. They would provide the agency through which the seeds could be distributed. They would be distributed wisely and well through such agencies, because the organization that distributed them would be responsible for the return of the money. I think within 30 days throughout all this section where this help is needed organizations of that kind could be provided.

Of course, where no such help is needed such an organiza-tion would not be forthcoming. Where it was needed, public sentiment and the disposition of the business people of the community to meet the needs of the community would immediately lead to the formation of such organization. In my State there are, I believe, several of them that could within a week place before the Secretary every needed evidence of their responsi-bility. He could furnish them the seed—

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?
Mr. MONDELL. In a moment. Or he could allow them to secure the seeds, giving them the necessary credits, and very promptly the machinery could be put in motion that would get into each section the seed that is needed. Before I yield to the gentleman, may I speak on a line of thought I have in mind? It may be said, if you are to do this in the territory you describe, why not do it everywhere. Because there is this difference in the situation: The country I have mentioned—
The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield me 10 minutes

additional?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman may continue for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wyoming may continue for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. I thank the gentleman. I yield to the

gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TOWNER. I was going to make the suggestion that the

gentleman ask for time in his own right.

Mr. MONDELL. Why are we asking this kind of aid in that particular section? Because it is a new country; because we have little accumulation of capital. In the older communities of the country, although there may be farmers just as needy as they are in these sections, and no doubt there are, there are men with capital who can handle these matters, who can furnish credit, whereas we are in a position where we lack capital. We lack the capital we have had in past years which has been extending this credit.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes. Mr. ROBBINS. Is it not a fact that the great difficulty with the American farmer to-day is lack of labor more than lack of

Mr. MONDELL. Well, there is a lack of labor, and there will be a lack of labor; but I do not think we should decline to aid the farmer in securing the seed that he is willing to plant because of the fact that there may be difficulty either in the planting or the harvesting of it. No farmer, as my friend understands, will ask for seed unless he feels reasonably assured he will be able to gather the harvest. No association such as those I have suggested will guarantee repayment except in communienough to gather the harvest. And you would be surprised how the people of a community rise to a situation like this.

The young boys, the girls, the old folks, the clerks, people in all employments give their help in time of need to gather the crops, and to a considerable extent in the planting of them and in the tending of them. I come from a country which mainly gave its quota before the draft, and so we were stripped of the stalwart young fellows early in the conflict. And yet we got along pretty well. I do not think any of our crops were lost because of the lack of labor, but it required the aid and help of everybody in the community. And the communities rose to the occasion. Of course, we brought in help from all directions and we paid perfectly fabulous prices.

Mr. ROBBINS. The trouble with Pennsylvania is this: The State Grange at a session last week passed resolutions from data obtained from members to the effect that they needed 210,000 laborers on the farms of Pennsylvania within the mem-

bership of the grange.

Mr. MONDELL. I think that is true, and I think that is a matter we should attend to. What I am interested in now is to get seed, because if we do not have the seed where it is needed there will be no crops. You probably do not have that difficulty, but the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BAER] knows the situation in his State, as I know it in mine, and that we need the seed, and our people need the aid in securing the seed, and they will be able to pay for it, and local organizations will vol-unteer to become responsible for the return of the funds and for the handling, administration, and distribution of the seed. All we want is a little credit.

Mr. BAER. Does not the gentleman think that this would bring more valuable results if it were loaned to the farmers on credit to enable them to get food and grain and cotton for our allies than to put it in these vast reservoirs out there where the farmers have not sufficient credit and it will not do any good? That is, if the grain is in the elevators and they have

not the cash to buy, it will not do them any good.

Mr. MONDELL. Whatever benefits may follow from other assistance and other help and come from other sources, here, it seems to me, is an opportunity to loan the Federal credit in a way that will certainly bring immediate returns in increased crop production, and it can be done in a way that will guarantee the return of the moneys without loss. Under a procedure of that sort, which is very simple, the Secretary of Agriculture could let it be known that he stood ready to hear from these voluntary associations, not to exceed one in a county, business associations of men who were responsible as to the amount they were willing to guarantee in repayment on seed, and in a very short time the machinery could be set in motion and the seed furnished.

This is a tremendously important thing. I have been hearing from my people for months in this matter of seed. I have said to them that I did not believe that Congress was disposed to make a free-seed distribution; that I doubted the wisdom of that sort of thing.

But there is a way to do it, expeditious, certain, comparatively simple, and I am sure in a great many communities in the State which my friend represents there are volunteer associations of business men and stockmen who would be willing to take this matter up.

Mr. BAER. Does the gentleman's constituents ask for free seed? It is my understanding that my constituents would not take free seed if they could get them. They do not want to be an object of charity. They want to borrow the money to get

Mr. MONDELL. Coming to think of it, I think those people who have suggested free seed come from just over the line; I do not have in mind anybody from Wyoming who has made that suggestion. [Laughter.] But they want an opportunity to plant their fields. They have gone through trying times of drought, and the country is new, and capital is exceedingly limited, and the banks are small.

Mr. COX. How about the labor supply?

Mr. MONDELL. I discussed that with my friend from Pennsylvania awhile ago. If the farmer does not feel that he has labor to plant the fields, he will not want to buy seed, and if a local association that is responsible for the repayment does not believe that the farmer can plant, cultivate, and harvest, it will not help him get the seed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming

has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition. I want to speak about 15 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. We have had 4 hours and 20 minutes of deties where they feel reasonably confident that there will be labor | bate, exactly divided between the two sides. That is very liberal debate. I hope the gentleman will not prolong the general debate at this time.

Mr. DILLON. I would like to have only 15 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman does that, other gentlemen will want time. I do not want to be discourteous to gentlemen, but I am anxious to make progress on the bill.

Mr. DHLLON. I have been in attendance for the last four weeks, and I was unable to get a hearing before the Committee

on Agriculture. I ask for 15 minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. This morning, before any time for debate was fixed, the gentleman from South Dakota had asked for 15 minutes, and he was assured he would get it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Very well. In view of that fact I shall not

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to address the committee for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILLON Mr. Chairman, it is constantly asserted that the live-stock market is controlled by the packers. Do these profiteers fix the price the producer is to receive and the price the consumer is to pay? It would seem so.

The cattleman ships his cattle to the stockyards. Wherever the stockyards are located the packing houses have their plants, The buyers of live stock each morning fix the price to be paid for live stock. There is but one price, one lone bidder, and the owner must accept the price offered. Otherwise, he must ship

back home, and his losses are beyond repair,

If he ships to another market he finds the same packers, the same profiteers, ready for the big bargains that are to fall into the combination net. They divide among themselves, on the basis of percentage, the live stock coming into the market. They likewise divide the territory and each packer has the exclusive right to sell in his territory. They fix the price for the farmer's stock and likewise the price that the consumer of finished products must pay. Thus they control both ends of the market.

In order to perfect their control they own the market places, stockyards, refrigerator cars, and cold-storage plants. They have driven out of business the small operators who formerly operated slaughterhouses. The local dealer in order to insure a steady supply must now buy from the big packing establish-

ments.

By their combination they control the meat supply from the stockyards to the consumer. No independent operator can break through the operations of these profiteers, who are entrenched behind the market places, the packing plants, the cold-storage plants, and the ownership of the refrigerator cars. They control every artery of trade in these products. In addition to the meat products, they control, in the same manner, all the by-products of the industry, such as lard, hides, fertilizer, and so forth.

The packers, the produce speculators, and the jobbers are in absolute control of all of the instrumentalities of the market. There are 75 cold-storage plants in New York City and 48 in Chicago. In these two large cities are found a combination of food profiteers fixing the selling price of the product in the hands of the producer and likewise fixing the price that the consumer

must pay

The Butter and Egg Board of Chicago fixes the daily price for eggs, butter, and poultry. They gamble in future delivery just the same as is done in the grain products. When these When these articles are plentiful they fix the price the producer is to receive, and then they buy all the available supply providing for future Through these gambling devices the price may be forced up or beaten down at the will of the profiteer,

The sale of fictitious eggs is constantly going on in these mar-The honest sale of eggs has almost become a mere incident of the business in these markets. Recent investigation in Chicago disclosed the appalling fact that 4,000 carloads of eggs that had never had any existence were bought and sold on the Chicago

Board of Trade.

Every time fictitious eggs are sold the sale is registered and aids in the fixing of prices for the real commodity. On every sale of these fictitious eggs the price is forced up one-half cent to 1 cent per dozen. It is said by one writer that these profiteers on the easter egg trade alone took \$6,000,000 of excess profits.

Herbert Hoover, before the Senate Committee on Agriculture

on June 19, 1917, made the following statement:

Thousands of men in this country who never owned a commodity in their life have bought canned goods, flour, wheat, and every food commodity to speculate for the rise.

He further stated:

Practically the entire wheat supply to Belgium is to-day imported from the United States, and, despite the extraordinary costs of transportation, the price of bread is 60 per cent of the price in New York City. A large portion of the wheat in France comes from this country, and yet the price of bread is, again, 40 per cent below our own. In England, where food control was started too late, the price is 30 per

cent below our price, and in Canada, again, we see a lower range of prices to the consumer than in our own country, although the producer realizes the same price.

John J. Dillon, former commissioner of foods of New York

State, says the food exchanges are "gambling dens."

It is said that New York City food profiteers one week in November, 1916, on the item of eggs alone, took a toll of \$1,000,-These eggs were purchased at about 17 cents per dozen and sold at 60 to 70 cents per dozen, after having been held for months. Investigation shows that it costs 2 cents per dozen to hold eggs for 10 months.

It is estimated that the people of New York City would save \$10,000,000 on eggs, \$7,000,000 on live poultry, and \$10,000,000 on dressed poultry annually by establishing municipal cold-storage plants. Apples are sold in the fall of the year for three to five dollars per barrel. The consumer later pays twelve to fifteen

dollars for the same apples.

The earnings of Armour & Co. in 1914 were \$7,509,000, while in 1916 they were \$20,100,000. Swift & Co. earned in 1914, \$9,450,000, in 1916 they earned \$20,465,000. In 1914 the United Fruit Co. earned \$2,264,000 and in 1916 they earned \$11,943,000. This is what the profiteers are doing to the producer and the consumer.

During the canning season, when the price is at the lowest point, the jobbers buy all the product of the plants engaged in canning fruits and vegetables. After the season is over they fix their own price by gentlemen's agreements and the consumer is forced to pay the price the combination fixes. There is no real competition in the jobbing trade on food products.

On account of market conditions vegetables and fruits frequently sell on the market at high prices while the supply is so great that it is rotting on the farms. The food speculators would rather destroy produce than lower the price to the consumer. Our system of distribution has broken down. From all parts of the country comes a demand for some new method of distribution to take the place of the inefficient, worn-out method now in use.

The middlemen have taken possession of the market places and converted them into veritable gambling dens. Nothing except the lash of public opinion will drive them from these public places. The producer must carry his products closer to the consumer, and the consumer must get in closer touch with the producer. Cooperative buying agencies and cooperative selling agencies is one solution of this difficult problem. Through these

agencies the profiteer can be eliminated.

It is doubtful if any one can defend the present market system. It is doubtful if a system of markets can be successfully regulated by law. Cooperative methods, if they can be properly financed, ought to remedy the evils existing in our market system. If success can not be acquired along cooperative lines the people will ultimately demand Government control and ownership of cold-storage plants, terminal markets, and public warehouses, operated either by State or National Government. When so operated the gambling dens, the combination of profiteers, and speculators in food products will be eliminated in favor of the producer and consumer. Give the farmer an honest market and he will produce the food. [Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Yes. Mr. DILLON.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest to the gentleman from South Dakota that if some of these profiteers who are robbing the people were put in the penitentiary, where they belong, It might help the situation also.

Mr. DILLON. I think it would. I think it ought to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE.

For expenses of experimental work and investigations undertaken by the Council of National Defense, by the advisory commission, or subordinate bodies; for the employment of a director, secretary, chief clerk, expert, clerical, and other assistance, equipment and supplies, including law books, books of reference, newspapers, and periodicals; subsistence and travel, including the expenses of members of the advisory commission or subordinate bodies going to and attending meetings of the advisory commission or subordinate bodies; rent of offices and grounds; repairs and upkeep of buildings occupied by the council; and printing and binding done at the Government Printing Office, \$250,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I was unfortunate not to hear the very able speech of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Sherley], so that I do not know just to what extent he went into some of these various items, but I desire to ask him with reference to this particular appropriation, and to inquire just

what experimental work is being conducted, and whether it comprehends activities by some of the various subcommittees or advisory bodies relating to war problems or tests made of materials used by the War Department?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman means tests by the Council

of National Defense?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; under this item. Mr. SHERLEY. I do not recall that there was any testimony touching the activities of the council in the way of experimental work. There is being done quite a bit of experimental work of a very valuable character by the Bureau of Standards, and some of that may have come about through direction of the council, but I think it more likely to have come as the direct

result of the War Department's suggestions or requests.

Mr. WALSH. Would that come out of that appropriation? Mr. SHERLEY. No. The language that has struck the gentleman is simply the language that was used in the first instance touching the Council of National Defense, and this \$250,000 is largely for the pay of employees and clerks of the various committees under the Council of National Defense. The gentleman will find in the hearings a very interesting account by Mr. Gifford, the director of the Council of National Defense, touching its existing organization and touching the elimination of committees—the subsidiary committees that grew up under the advisory commission. The gentleman will recall that it is both a council and an advisory commission.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. Mr. SHERLEY. There has been some criticism in the past of the advisory committees because they were composed of men largely representing industries with which they were supposed to deal. Most of these committees have now distributed their duties and the organizations which speak for these industries have no governmental connection. Those former committees have largely been eliminated. The gentleman will find an interesting statement along that line.

Mr. WALSH. This general reorganization that has been effected, I suppose, is set forth in the hearings?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is an attempt by question and answer to give a clear view of the existing relationship of the council and the subsidiary committees to the organization. It is set out in some detail. The statement by Mr. Gifford is a very creditable one. He made a very enlightening statement.

Mr. WALSH. I understand he is still the director?

Mr. SHERLEY. He is still the director. Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's pro forma amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question right there. What limit is there on the item of sub-sistence in this paragraph? Is there any limitation by law as

to how much could be allowed per day from this amount?

Mr. SHERLEY. Four dollars' per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence or \$5 of actual expense. That is the law.

Mr. BLACK. That is the law, and they could not exceed that amount?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. BLACK. It would not be necessary to put in any limitation?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think not. I think at some time we shall have to enlarge that limitation of \$4 in connection with certain classes of people, because I think it is not covering their actual expenses in some instances; but I think the limitation as it exists applies to the council without need of further legislation,

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS.

The limitation upon the amount which may be expended for office rent in the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1918, contained in the naval appropriation act approved March 4, 1917, is increased from \$1,500 to \$2,332.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to obtain information from the chairman of the committee as to whether the subcommittee made any provision or any inquiry as to allowing additional rental to the Vocational Educational Board?

Mr. SHERLEY.

SHERLEY. No; we did not, There is a bill pending in the House granting them additional authority for rental purposes in the District of Columbia, and I wished to know whether the com-

mittee took any action on that subject.

Mr. SHERLEY. We did not, because there was nothing formal before the committee. A gentleman called informally to see me touching the matter to which the gentleman from Wisconsin refers. That bill, in my judgment, ought not to become a law, because it would take all the funds that they have avail-

able for this purpose. Something undoubtedly ought to be done in connection with taking care of their rent situation, but the committee did not and ought not to consider matters that do not come before them in the regular way. At the time I had the talk with the gentleman I suggested that the way that matter would probably be considered would be by the submission of a proper estimate; and I still think that is the way to have it considered

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman recognizes the need of some authorization to this board to provide authority for them to pay

for their present quarters.

Mr. SHERLEY. They have an actual deficiency and it will have to be paid; but there are some things in connection with that situation that I think are not altogether to be commended. The committee did not feel that they ought to deal with the

matter without a formal request.

I will say further, in reply to the gentleman, that there are a number of things that will probably have to be picked up in the Senate. The committee found itself in a situation where, if it was to report the bill at all, it had to draw a dead line touching new estimates. We could be considering this bill yet if we had permitted the departments to continue to send estimates down; so we finally served notice that estimates that came in thereafter fell outside the dead line and that they would have to be taken up in the Senate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma

amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

For additional employees in the Department of State, \$50,000: Provided, That not more than four persons shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the chairman of the committee kindly explain the reason for granting to the Department of State this additional \$50,000 for clerical services here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SHERLEY. A part of it was for the purpose of providing for the continuation of the pay of employees that they now have. A part of it represents an increase in the number of such employees. Broadly speaking, the situation is this: The State Department has had and will continue to have a very great expansion under present conditions, and it was important that they not only have additional clerical help, but that to a limited extent they have additional high-paid help, and therefore the provision is carried that not more than four persons may be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum. The reason for this is that there is a certain character of confidential work, the gathering together of intelligences that come to the Government not only through the State Department but through naval and military sources, and work in connection with the War-Trade Board, that require men of very high grade, who could not be expected to be obtained for \$1,800.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that these employees are to be engaged in clerical work? Or will they be employed in other

capacities?

Mr. SHERLEY. Most of them will be clerks, except these four, who will be engaged in work of a good deal higher order than just purely clerical work. And as I stated, a large part of it will be in connection with the handling and arranging of the intelligences that are received through the State, military, naval, and other agencies of the Government, and which the gentleman will appreciate is a matter of first magnitude and value at this time.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have had this very problem under consideration in connection with the framing of the legislative appropriation bill. The estimate in that connection is for \$120,000 and the revised estimate for the next fiscal year is \$264,000. The phraseology is somewhat different, and I was wondering whether there is any need of having it in the form of additional employees. As carried in the estimate for the legislative bill the phraseology is "for additional clerical services, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of State."

Mr. SHERLEY. As I recall, the request before the subcommittee of which the gentleman is a member was to change the language in which the estimate was originally submitted into language corresponding with this which is now carried in this

bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. That may be.
Mr. SHERLEY, I think the gentleman will find that is the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have a note on my copy of the bill, making some suggestions along that line, but I do not recall distinctly whether we were to strike out "clerical services," and just say "additional employees."

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it was desired that we should use the language employed herein.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the pro forma amendment. Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to

revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the

gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection. The Clerk read as follows:

Post allowances to consular and diplomatic officers: To enable the President, in his discretion and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to consular and diplomatic officers in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, \$400,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the I notice that the committee has extended the authority of the existing phraseology in the diplomatic bill so as to authorize the Department of State to increase the salaries of the consular and diplomatic representatives at all posts rather than the authority, as conferred in the last Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, to our consular and diplomatic officers of a belligerent country and countries adjacent thereto.

Mr. SHERLEY. This language is in exact accord with the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill as it passed the House. The reason for the change in that bill and in this was this: The need was not confined simply to belligerent countries and to nonbelligerent countries designated heretofore. For instance, there are South American countries where the condition is more acute than it is abroad in the warring countries and countries adjacent to the warring countries. A statement presented by the State Department was of such unquestioned need that we could not do otherwise. For instance, it developed in one instance that there was a loss on exchange of 25 per cent. In other words, the salary of the man stationed there was reduced 25 per cent by the exchange loss. We simply allowed a sum that, in the discretion of the Secretary of State, might enable him to equitably deal with these people.

Mr. STAFFORD. Did the Secretary of State advise the committee whether he intended to pursue a uniform policy in all countries with reference to the salaries of diplomatic and con-

sular representatives?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I do not know that it is possible to pursue a uniform course. I do say that it would be dependent on the actual situation and need. There are some places where a very slight increase might be necessary, or none at all, and there are other places where there would have to be a large allowance made. There was no way of our undertaking to determine the matter except by general consideration of the situation and the appropriation of a sum that would not permit

of great extravagance and yet would relieve the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the bill which passed the House last
Saturday, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, there is an authorization of \$800,000, which is virtually 50 per cent of the salaries paid to the consular and diplomatic officers.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the gentleman is mistaken in his figures.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have the bill here. Mr. SHERLEY. Not mistaken in the amount of \$800,000, but the amount of the salaries to the consular and diplomatic offi-zers—it is more than \$1,600,000 I think.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will give the gentleman the figures carried in the bill. There is \$534,350 to ambassadors and ministers, and for consular officers, \$1,208,500.

Mr. SHERLEY. There are quite a number of other officers that the gentleman has not enumerated.

Mr. STAFFORD. This phraseology only goes to post allowances for consular and diplomatic officers,

Mr. SHERLEY. The post allowance does not mean that it limited simply to the salaries of consular and diplomatic

officers. It relates to other employees of the embassy. Mr. STAFFORD. Is the phraseology broad enough to warrant

Mr. SHERLEY. I think so, unquestionably. We have been acting under it, and we appropriated \$100,000 for officers in Chin and \$200,000 for officers of belligerent countries at the last

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to have the gentleman's opinion as to whether this phraseology carried in this bill, as well as in the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, is broad enough to allow an allowance to others than the consular and diplomatic officers

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; it says for post allowances. means for the post; it does not mean for consular and diplomatic officers alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.
Mr. STAFFORD. I ask for three minutes more.
The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks for three minutes more.
Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. The secretary to the embassy and legation is a diplomatic officer?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.
Mr. SHERLEY. It is a post allowance and not to consular and diplomatic officers alone. In other words, the allowance is to the post. It is not simply to increase the salary of the diplomatic officer and the consular officer, but also for his employees at the different posts.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does that include the minister or the

Mr. SHERLEY. It might include him, but in point of fact it was not intended to include him.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does it include him, and have any of these salaries been raised?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not that I know of, but the language is broad enough to deal with all of them.

Mr. LONGWORTH. They certainly ought to be, and I would be glad to know that some of them had been included,

Mr. FLOOD. It has not been paid to the minister or to the

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will read the qualifying language after the title he will find that the phraseology is limited to make special allowances by way of additional com-pensation to consular and diplomatic officers in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at posts to which they may be assigned.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the word "officers" there means

clerks, as well as diplomatic and consular officers.

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not say "officer"; it says "officers." Mr. SHERLEY. "Officers" means more than simply the The clerk is an officer within the meaning of this. Mr. STAFFORD. I would not construe the word "clerk"

Mr. SHERLEY. It has been so construed. The gentleman can be perfectly sure that if that were not true the State Department would have asked for a change of language.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am glad to have the statement of the gentleman that this authorization means not only, as it apparently does on its face, to provide additional compensation to officers, but that it can be used also for the secretarial force or the clerical force.

Mr. SHERLEY. They need it more than the others.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know that, but there is no provision in

express language covering their cases,
Mr. SHERLEY. I think it does cover their cases

Mr. SHERLEY. I think it does cover their cases.
Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Virginia Flood] says these are never paid to the ministers or ambassa-

Mr. FLOOD. I say it has not yet. Mr. LONGWORTH. Therefore it must be paid to the clerks and secretaries.

The Clerk read as follows:

For washing and hemming towels, purchase of awnings and fixtures, window shades and fixtures, alcohol, benzine, turpentine, varnish, baskets, belting, bellows, bowls, brooms, buckets, brushes, canvas, crash, cloth, chamois skins, cotton waste, door and window fasteners, dusters; flower-garden, street, and engine hose; lace leather, lye, nails, oils, plants, picks, pitchers, powders, steucil plates, hand stamps and repairs of same, spittoons, soap, matches, match safes, sponges, tacks, traps, thermometers, toilet paper, tools, towels, towel racks, tumblers, wire, zinc, and for blacksmithing, repairs of machinery, removal of rubbish, sharpening tools, street car tickets not exceeding \$250, advertising for proposals, and for sales at public auction in Washington, D. C., of condemned property belonging to the Treasury Department, payment of auctioneer fees, and purchase of other absolutely necessary articles, \$3,500.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last

I notice in this item and in one or two other items in the bill, an amount specified for street car tickets. I wish to ask if it is the practice to pay the street car transportation of the employees in these departments, or for what purpose these street car tickets are used?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is the usual language carried in the regular appropriation. The enumeration was to prevent the amount being exceeded, and simply applies to those cases where messengers or employees are sent on official business and are given street car tickets for that purpose. It is not the practice nor should it be the practice to pay the car fare of employees generally.

The Clerk read as follows:

For salaries of officers and employees, \$1.268.000; furniture, equipment, and supplies, including not exceeding \$100 for street car tickets, \$121,000; traveling expenses, including not exceeding \$4 per diem in lieu of subsistence, \$24.000; telegraph and telephone service, \$4,800; stationery and miscelleneous expenses, including subscriptions to periodicals, \$20,000; printing and binding, \$60,000; rental of quarters, \$40.000; in all, \$1,537.800.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee if this appropriation is to cover a deficiency in salaries of officers and employees, in addition to the appropriation which was made

when that bureau was authorized?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. The money that was appropriated then Mr. SHERLEY. Yes, the money that was appropriated dien would not have carried it to any extent. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars was given, and they have had \$500,000 from the President, which I spoke of in my general address, and which they asked to have returned, but which we are not returning. This sum of \$1.537,800 is to carry them up to July. I think this ought to be said about the War-Risk Bureau: They have had a very unusual task. It is no small matter to organize a bureau to deal with a million or more of men in the service, to arrange the allowances that should be made to de-pendents under the law, to take care of the insurance phase of the law, and to carry on the other activities that existed under the old law relative to insurance of ships and crews. They are getting under way and have now gotten out all of the November and December checks. They have been aided in their organiza-tion by the Bureau of Efficiency. The hearings disclose some of the problems and some of the waste that they have undertaken to meet. They have been seriously handicapped by lack of space, and they should and will have, I hope, before we are through, housing capacity in a fireproof building.

They are now scattered around through the National Museum

and a number of other places. They have been doing an efficient work, considering their difficulties. The committee allowed them all that they thought they could properly expend between now and July 1, because we believed that everybody in this Congress and this country wanted to make sure the prompt and efficient payment of moneys to the dependents of the boys who were at the front. We have not tried to restrict them unnecessarily. We hope we have supplied them with funds enough for them to go forward economically and take

care of this work.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state the number of em-

ployees in this very important bureau?

Mr. SHERLEY. They have about 1,700 now. The gentleman will find in the hearings a detailed statement as to the number and compensation of employees at that time. They expect to have about 1,200 more employees.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman allow me to state that it so happened that I made an inquiry of the department on that very question last Saturday, and at that time they had over 2,000 employees and had issued \$7,000,000,000 of insurance.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman's information is a month later than mine. I, of necessity, have to speak of the date of the hearing, and that was about a month ago. At that time they had 1,700.

Mr. TREADWAY. I had the information last Saturday night,

and they had then over 2,000.

Mr. WALSH. I am indebted to the gentleman from Kentucky for the information he has given and agree with him that there should be no desire to be parsimonious in the allowance to this bureau. And I am also very much interested to learn that the delay in sending out these checks is being obviated, because I have had several communications and inquiries in reference to the allotment to soldiers, and I understand the delay-

Mr. SHERLEY. I think they are catching up very rapidly, and they expect to be able to stay current. I want to say another thing that may interest the gentleman. I suggested during the hearing, and probably it had been suggested before, that it was greatly desirable that every soldier should have a number that he should always retain, and that the attempt to classify him by name, regiment, company, State, or locality would end necessarily in confusion. That prophecy was more than verified by the very unfortunate loss of life recently in connection with the sinking of one of our transports.

It is my understanding now that the War Department proposes, in connection with the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, to give a number, which shall remain the same always, to all of our men in the service.

Mr. WALSH. And that will be done for the military branch

of the service, for identification for all purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The same number will be used always and will make a perfect identification.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional clerks from March 1 to June 30, 1918, inclusive, at rates of compensation as follows: Clerks—1 of class 4 and 1 of class 1; in all, \$1,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee if any request was made from the Secret Service Division of the Treasury for an appropriation to permit that division or branch of the department to increase its force of secret-service men. I understand that they do not have a very large force of men, and that a great deal of the so-called secret-service work is being performed by the bureau in the Department of Justice, and upon inquiry which I have made from time to time of the Treasury Department they stated that they are not able to increase their force because the appropriation is so limited.

Mr. SHERLEY. They did not ask in this bill for anything of the kind. They asked for \$1,500, which was based on the additional clerks needed from January to June 30, and we gave them \$1,000, because this bill will not become a law before March, and, figuring at the rate of four months instead of six

months, it makes \$1,000.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman know in connection with any other measure which may come from his committee whether there is any proposition to increase the number of employees in that bureau'

Mr. SHERLEY. My impression is there is an increase asked

in the sundry civil bill.

We increased their number slightly last year, and as far as I understand there is a request for an increase now.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk rend as follows:

The unexpended balance of appropriation of \$100,000 contained in the deficiency appropriation act approved October 6, 1917, for repairs, alterations, and extensions of certain buildings and their equipment belonging to the United States on squares No. 226 and No. 228 in the city of Washington, is made available for the repair, alteration, and extension of such buildings and their equipment belonging to the United States on square No. 227, in the city of Washington, as the Secretary of the Treasury may designate, to fit them for temporary use by the Treasury Department Department.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last Will the gentleman state where these buildings are word. located?

Mr. SHERLEY. These buildings are located catacorner from the Treasury Department at Fifteenth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, and extend southerly. There are three squares of buildings there. The old Poli Theater is on part of it. And in that connection I want to say for the benefit of the gentleman and the committee that there has been submitted to the Congress an estimate from the Treasury Department looking to the acquirement of the Arlington site and the erection there of a building for the housing of the Internal Revenue Bureau and the War-Risk Insurance Bureau.

Mr. WALSH. The Hotel Arlington? Mr. SHERLEY. Where the old Hot Where the old Hotel Arlington was. That estimate came to the committee too late for it to give it consideration, and it is too important a matter to be acted on without full hearing and consideration. The proposal is for an expenditure of about \$4,200,000, which would acquire the land and give us a 10-story building and an annex.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Is not there a building in the process of erection?

Mr. SHERLEY. There is, but it is only in process of erection, and this would acquire the ground and take over the contracts and the fabricated steel-some 80 or 90 per cent of which is already fabricated-and may offer the solution of the housing needs of the Treasury Department, because the proposals made in this bill for buildings are not sufficient to take care of the Treasury needs.

Mr. WALSH. That would be a fireproof building?

Mr. SHERLEY. A permanent building.

Mr. NORTON. As to the building that is going up on the Arlington site now, south of the University Club, has the contract been made for the rent of that by the Government?

Mr. SHERLEY. No; I was just saying that an estimate had been submitted by the Treasury Department asking for an appropriation of \$4,200,000 for the acquiring of the property and taking over of the contract for certain portions of the material, and erecting that building to some 10 stories in height.

Mr. NORTON. The building that is now being put up there is being put up, I understand, by private parties, with the expectation of renting it, though, to the Federal Government.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know anything about their expectations. There has no assurance been given of any kind, and

there is no authority as yet for the rental of it.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit? Is it being built as an office building or as a hotel? I refer to this building that is in the course of erection.

Mr. SHERLEY. It started out originally as a hotel, I think,

but is now being erected as an office building.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the

pro forma amendment.

In the committee this afternoon we had up the subject, and perhaps the chairman of the committee made investigations in his subcommittee as to the Government taking possession of the property to the west of the Poli Theater that for a number of years has been occupied by a moderate-priced hotel. That property would be suitable, I would say, for office purposes, and no testimony has ever been advanced by any of the Treasury officials as to whether that property was available for office purposes or not.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I have made no personal investigation, but it is my understanding that the Treasury Department did, and reported that the size of the rooms and the character of them were such as not to make it worth while to take over the property. It is under a lease, which can be canceled, of course, but I think there is a 30-day limit to it. Now, personally, I know nothing as to the property. I understand the rental is a fair rental as rentals went in the old days, and that the property is not of such a character as to lend itself readily to use by the Government for office purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Detroit, Mich.: Attendants' quarters building, \$31,500.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, might I inquire of the chairman of the committee when he expects the committee to rise?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will say to the gentleman that I hope very shortly to move to rise. I thought we might run through some of these Treasury items, which would carry us to the District of Columbia items, and the committee could then rise. That will probably take five minutes, unless we strike something that is a matter of controversy, in which event I will move to rise

The Clerk read as follows:

New York (Stapleton): Remodeling old white house for attendants' quarters, psychiatric units, female nurses' quarters, ambulance house, junior medical officers' quarters (temporary), temporary hospital ward unit, and approach work; mechanical equipment, including refrigerating plant, telephone and bedside call systems, \$256,500; miscellaneous furniture and equipment, \$45,000; in all, \$301,500.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman from Kentucky state what the general policy of the department is with reference to the

extension and remodeling of these marine hospitals?

Mr. SHERLEY. It was to provide for an increase of 744 beds in the marine hospitals. There has been an increased demand upon the marine hospitals, aside from the demands that would come incident to the war. Under our compensation law governmental employees who are injured are eligible to treatment in such hospitals, and then the growth of the merchant marine and the growth of the naval service have put added demands

upon the marine hospitals.

The Public Health Service presented plans for the improvement of a number of marine hospitals. The gentleman will find them enumerated throughout the bill. We allowed them, with a cut of practically 10 per cent that was made because there were certain items in connection with officers' quarters and attendants' quarters that seemed to us to be extravagant. call that at Boston, Mass., it was proposed to build a \$16,000 frame house of eight rooms. The committee thought that a little skill would enable them to build an eight-room frame house for less than \$16,000. They considered the matter carefully, and were led to believe that the necessary quarters can be provided. without spending so much money from the Treasury. We feel sure that can be done.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state whether the extension or remodeling of these marine hospitals was induced by a possible demand owing to the return in the future of men injured

in the service?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes. There has been a presidential order making the marine hospitals open for the use of the Navy, and I have no doubt that if the need should arise they could be used for the Army as well, and probably will be.

Mr. WALSH. I assume that in this remodeling it is an at-

tempt to modernize the equipment?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is in a sense; but the gentleman will find the details set out under each heading. The purpose largely was to increase bed capacity.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky how much longer he desires the committee to sit before he will move to rise?

Mr. SHERLEY. I just stated that if we could read until we reached the heading, "District of Columbia," on page 18, I would move to rise. It will take only a few minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Very well.

The CHAIDMAN. The Clark will road.

The Clerk will read. The CHAIRMAN.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

For engravers' and printers' materials and other materials except distinctive paper, miscellaneous expenses, including paper for internal-revenue stamps, and for purchase, maintenance, and driving of necessary motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles, when, in writing, ordered by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$400,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire as to what is the reason for authorizing the purchase of passenger-carrying vehicles under the Bureau of Engraving and Printing?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is just the usual language. It is the current language. This \$400,000 was not for commercial vehicles

Mr. STAFFORD. That was the purpose of my inquiry, whether it was planned to authorize the bureau or the Director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to purchase a passenger-carrying vehicle.

Mr. SHERLEY. It was not. If we had changed the language it probably would mean the opening of a new account on the

Treasury books.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

District of Columbia.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Garner, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9867) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Jones of Texas for 10 days, on account of serious illness in his family.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE FOR 1918.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, Washington, February 11, 1918.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Sir: At the request of the Secretary of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, I have the honor to inclose herewith, for the information of the House of Representatives, a copy of a circular issued by the Nobel Committee furnishing information as to the distribution of the Nobel peace prize for the year 1918.

I have the honor to be, sir.

Your obedient servant,

ROBERT LANSING.

[Det Norske Stortings Nobelkomité. Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament.]

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE.

All proposals of candidates for the Nobel peace prize, which is to be distributed December 10, 1918, must, in order to be taken into consideration, be laid before the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament by a duly qualified person before the 1st of February of the same

ment by a duly qualited person before the 1st of February of the same year.

Any one of the following persons is held to be duly qualified: (a) Members and late members of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, as well as the advisers appointed at the Norwegian Nobel Institute; (b) members of Parliament and members of government of the different States, as well as members of the Interparliamentary Union; (c) members of the International Arbitration Court at The Hague; (d) members of the commission of the Permanent International Peace Bureau; (e) members and associates of the Institute of International Lâw; (f) university professors of political science and of law, of history, and of philosophy; and (g) persons who have received the Nobel peace prize may also be accorded to institutions or associations.

According to the Code of Statutes, section 8, the grounds upon which any proposal is made must be stated and handed in along with such papers and other documents as may therein be referred to.

According to section 3, every written work to qualify for a prize must have appeared in print.

For particulars qualified persons are requested to apply to the office of the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, Drammensvel 19, Kristiania.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a communication addressed to the President and to the Members of Congress by the executive committee of the Socialist Party of the United States

under date of February 9, 1918, and a copy of my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentlemen asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an address by the executive committee of the Socialist Party of the United States to the President and Congress and the reply of the gentleman from Texas to the same. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. Jones of Texas] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a letter recently addressed to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Whose letter?
Mr. BLACK. The letter of my colleague [Mr. Jones of

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Black] asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. Jones of Texas] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record by printing a letter written by him to the Foreign Affairs Committee. there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, upon what subject?

Mr. BLACK. It is a short letter in reference to a peace resolution introduced last August.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 16, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were

taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the treasurer of the Washington-Virginia Railway Co., transmitting report of the Washington-Virginia Railway Co. for the year ending December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 935); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the United States Public Health Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, for maintenance and ordinary expenses of the Quarantine Service (H. Doc. No. 936); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows: Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which

was referred the Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 104) authorizing the assistant to the Secretary of the Interior to sign official papers and documents, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No 316), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar,
Mr. HAMLIN, from the Committee on the Territories, to which

was referred the bill (H. R. 9832) to authorize the incorporated town of Seward. Alaska, to issue bonds in any sum not exceeding \$25,000 for the purpose of constructing dikes, flumes, and other works to confine the waters of Lowell Creek for the protection of said town, reported the same without amendment, accompaniel by a report (No. 317), which said bill and report were

referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANGLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7738) to increase the rate of pension allowed to Army nurses, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 318), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 9897) to authorize the contesting and cancellation of certain homestead entries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 9898) to establish in the Coast Artillery Corps of the Regular Army an Army mine-planter service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9899) authorizing appropriations made for the national security and defense to be used for the purchase of real estate, or the use thereof, when such purpose is not specifically stated in said appropriation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9900) authorizing the President during the existing emergency to sell war supplies, materials, and equipment heretofore or hereafter purchased, acquired, or manufactured by the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9901) to give indemnity for damages caused by American forces abroad; to the Committee on Military Af-

Also, a bill (H. R. 9902) to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9903) to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9904) to amend present laws restricting the

purchase and distribution of military stores and supplies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs,

Also, a bill (H. R. 9905) to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 9906) providing that postoffice laborers be allowed a concompetitive examination for promotion; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 9907) providing commutation of quarters for officers of the Army during the period of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 9908) to amend sections 4402. 4404, and 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON: Resolution (H. Res. 250) for the relief of Mary M. Savoy; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 247) to investigate the Brude lifeboat; to the Committee on Naval Affairs. By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Memorial of the General Assembly

of the State of Rhode Island indorsing the so-called daylightsaving bill now before Congress, and urging the Senators and Representatives from that State to give it their cordial support; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, indorsing the so-called daylight-saving bill now before Congress and urging the Senators and Representatives from that State to give it their cordial support; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, indorsing the socalled daylight-saving bill now before Congress and urging the Senators and Representatives from that State to give it their cordial support; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 9909) granting a pension to

Thomas W. Atchley; to the Committee on Pensions, By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 9910) granting an increase of pension to John Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER; A bill (H. R. 9911) granting an increase of pension to John A. J. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: A bill (H. R. 9912) granting a pension to George B. Trayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 9913) granting an increase of pension to Sanford E. Chaffee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 9914) granting an increase

of pension to George Joseph; to the Committee on Pensions. By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9915) granting an increase of pension to Harry E. Bryan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H R. 9916) granting a pension to Carl N. Hubley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill' (H. R. 9917) granting a pension to Stephen K.

Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 9918) granting a pension to Zebulon R. Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 9919) to correct the military record of Darius Atkinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 9920) granting a pension to Mary A. Himmah; to the Committee on Invalid

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 9921) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Keene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 9922) granting an increase of pension to Francis Roy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 9923) for the relief of

John McW. Ford; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 9924) granting an increase of pension to John P. Bateman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9925) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid

on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Irishwomen's Council, asking for the recognition of the independence of Ireland in the form of an Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

Also (by request), .esolution of the Grand Army of the Republic, favoring legislation giving American citizenship to aliens who serve in the Army or Navy; to the Committee on Immigra-

tion and Naturalization.

Also (by request), resolution of the Grand Army of the Republic, requesting the enactment of legislation for the return of the remains of those soldiers and sailors who may die abroad;

to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), resolution of the Grand Army of the Republic, asking for the passage of a bill providing for the payment of pensions monthly instead of quarterly; also a resolution of the same organization, asking for increase of pension to Civil War Veterans and aid to blind veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution of the Twentieth Century Topic Club, asking for the repeal of the periodical postage provisions

of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means. By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Mrs. Margaret Walthauser, Mrs. Louise Lang, Mrs. S. Althof, and 18 others, praying for the passage of House bill 7995, for the preservation of the Niagara, Commodore Perry's flagship in the Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DILL: Petition of citizens of Spokane, Wash., asking for the passage of House bill 5531; to the Committee on Military

Affairs

By Mr. ESCH: Papers in support of House bill 9838, granting a pension to Sarah Morrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pen-

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Oblong, Ill., protesting against grading second-class postage on any zone basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Dr. F. A. Eastman and 60 other citizens of Rockford, Ill., opposing the zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means, By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution of the New York Antivivisec-

tion Society, protesting against compulsory inoculation of soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. M. McLarin, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, against the Borland eight-hour amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of George F. Washburn, president Massachusetts Real Estate Exchange, favoring legislation for Federal acquisition of railways and canals to transport coal from mines near coast to all points along Atlantic coast; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Affidavits to accompany House bill 9841, granting a pension to Charles B. Carlson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Woman's Club of Racine, Wis., and by the New Century Club of Wichita Falls, Tex., urging the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act increasing postage rates on periodicals; to the Committee

on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, indorsing the daylight-saving bill now before Congress, and urging the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island to give it their support; to the Committee on

Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TILLMAN: Resolution of a mass meeting held in Fayetteville, Ark., expressing loyalty to and confidence in the administration, especially in its conduct of the war, and deploring that criticism of the war management which has been of a destructive character; to the Committee on Military Affairs,

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 16, 1918.

(Legislative day of Friday, February 15, 1918.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

RAILROAD CONTROL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a

quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

ankhead hamberlain olt ulberson ummins urtis rance allinger lale	Henderson James Johnson, Cal. Johnson, S. Dak. Jones, N. Mex. Jones, Wash. Kellogg Knox Lodge McCumber	Overman Saulsbury Shafroth Sheppard Smith, Mich. Smith, S. C. Smoot Swanson Thomas Thomas	Tillman Townsend Trammeli Underwood Vardaman Warren Watson Weeks Willams Wolcott
--	--	--	---

Mr. JAMES. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. Beckham] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees,

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. McNary, Mr. New, Mr. Owen, Mr. Poindexter, Mr. Reed, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. New, Mr. OWEN, Mr. TORNEATER, Mr. REED and Mr. SUTHERLAND answered to their names when called.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I wish to state that my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], is absent owing

to illness.

Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Ashurst, Mr. Harding, Mr. Hitch-cock, Mr. King, Mr. Kirry, Mr. Sterling, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Norris entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I wish to announce that on Tuesday next after the routine morning business, with the consent of the Senate, I shall speak to the pending bill and the demonstrated necessity for Government ownership.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is very evident that for the time being at least the attention of Senators is given to certain hearings, investigations, and so forth, and Senators are going to committee rooms rather than appearing on the floor of the Senate. So it is almost impossible for us to

keep a quorum here, at least to keep enough Senators here to justify business in debating the pending measure.

I wish to give notice now that on Monday next I shall make an effort to have some definite time fixed at which we shall get a vote on this bill. It seems to me that if the procedure we have followed up to the present is to be kept up, it might be a very good plan to adjourn the Senate until the work of the investigating committees has ceased.

Mr. THOMAS. Or adjourn sine die.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. As the Senator from Colorado suggests, it might be very well to adjourn sine die and let the business of the country be transacted in the committee